

Har
AC
901
Al
no. 434

J. F. C. Harrison.

THE SOCIALIST LIBRARY. VI.



The Socialist Library—VI.

Edited by J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.

SOCIALISM
AND THE
DRINK QUESTION.

BY

PHILIP SNOWDEN, M.P.



LONDON:
INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY,
23, Bride Lane, E.C.

—
1908.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. The Problem Stated	I
II. The Temperance Movement	18
III. Labour Organisations and Drink	24
IV. Who Consumes the Drink?	34
V. Causes of Drinking	44
VI. Social Conditions.. ..	55
VII. Other Causes	66
VIII. Social Reform and Temperance.. ..	71
IX. Drink and Economic Poverty	85
X. Economics of Temperance	94
XI. State Prohibition.. ..	109
XII. Local Option	119
XIII. Disinterested Management	139
XIV. Trust Companies in Britain	149
XV. Public Control and Municipalisation	159
XVI. Municipalisation	171
XVII. Advantages and Objections	183
XVIII. Conclusion	191
Appendix I.	193
Appendix II.	196
Appendix III.	200
Index	202

SOCIALISM AND THE DRINK QUESTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROBLEM STATED.

THE obvious evils of the drink traffic have raised the subject to the rank of a question of foremost political and social importance.

The results of no other social evil are so apparent. Gambling may reduce a family to starvation ; commercial speculation may lead to ruin ; capitalism, by low wages, may cause poverty and physical deterioration, and drive women to shame ; landlordism may be responsible for the ruin of agriculture and the degradation of the labourers to the position of serfs ; but the relation between cause and effect in these cases is not so obvious and immediate as between drink and the misery, poverty, ruin, crime, lunacy, disease, and death which the traffic brings in its train.

The evil effects of drinking cannot be hidden. They obtrude themselves upon our attention at every turn. The public house is everywhere. The reeling and brutalised victims of drink meet us in the streets ; the slum areas of our towns reek with its filthy odours.

Drink pulls men down to the gutter from positions of honour and usefulness. The columns of our newspapers are filled with the stories of debaucheries, assaults, outrages, and murders done in drink. The time of our police courts is mainly occupied in hearing cases in which drink and the public-house figure ; our prisons have always thousands of inmates, sent there through drink ; our lunatic asylums are fed to a considerable extent by drink ; judges are unanimous in assigning to drink the responsibility for much of the crime they have to condemn ; doctors ascribe to drink much of the physical degeneration of the age, and regard it as one of the most potent causes of disease, physical and mental ; the educationalist and the social reformer find drink to be one of the chief hindrances in their path, for it enfeebles the physical strength of the workers, it saps their independence, it destroys their self-respect, it lowers their ideal of life, it makes them content in poverty and filth, it destroys their intelligence, it makes them the easy victims of every unscrupulous exploiter who seeks to batten upon them.

A person does not need to be a fanatical teetotaler to subscribe to the strongest indictment which can be framed against the drink traffic as one of the greatest curses which afflict our country and mankind to-day. 'It is probably true that the flagrant and obvious evils which are associated with drink have

tended to give an exaggerated conception of the extent to which it is responsible, as a primary or isolated cause, for the economic, physical, and moral condition of the people. The connection between drink and the apparent results is so close to the casual observer that it is little wonder the Drink Question should have been raised to the category of a special social evil—a first cause of many resultant evils, and therefore an evil capable of independent treatment. It will be one of the chief objects of this little work to endeavour to prove that the Drink Question is but one phase of the Social Problem; that it cannot be completely solved apart from the treatment of the whole problem of the economic and social condition of the people; that the Drink Evil is one of the forms—and perhaps, from many points of view, the gravest—of waste—economical, physical, mental, and moral—which is inherent in our present method of wealth production and ownership.

The importance of the Drink Question must appeal to the Socialist for the same reasons which the questions of landlordism, capitalism, competition, housing, education, appeal to him. The Socialist case for the collective control of land and wealth production, for the organisation of distribution, for better housing and better education, is based upon the social loss in material wealth, in knowledge, in efficiency, in comfort, in health, and

in morality which arises from the present system. The Drink Evil is perfectly analogous. One need not understand deeply the causes of the waste of commercial competition, nor of bad housing, nor of the ignorance of the masses, to appreciate the social loss of wealth, of health, and of knowledge arising therefrom. In like manner, leaving for the moment the question of the cause of drinking, the Socialist will admit the economic, physical and moral loss to society from the existence of the drink traffic.

As the economic aspects of the problem will demand extensive consideration at a later stage of our enquiry, we shall in this chapter consider briefly some of the physical, mental, and moral ravages of this form of Social Waste.

DRINK AND CRIME.

In the ten years ending 1905 the number of prosecutions for drunkenness in England and Wales was 2,068,725, or an average of over 200,000 a year. In 1906 there were over 100,000 arrests for drunkenness in Scotland. These figures by no means express fully the extent to which drink employs our policemen, police courts, and judges, and fills our gaols and convict prisons. In addition to these prosecutions for simple drunkenness, many of the cases of assaults were the outcome of drinking. "Drunkenness is no doubt the cause of many crimes, and is the accompani-

ment of many others.”* This is the conclusion of Sir John Macdonell, Master of the Supreme Court, who edits the Report of Judicial Statistics. It is pointed out in his report that there are many persons drunk when taken into custody, but the charge of drunkenness is dropped because the persons are charged with more serious offences. In Manchester, in 1905, 8,734 persons were drunk when arrested ; but of this number only 7,626 were proceeded against for being drunk and disorderly in the street, the other 1,108 having a more serious charge made against them.

The figures of arrests for Drunkenness in one town (Liverpool) will help to convey an impression of the extent of the evil and the social waste of wealth and human life caused by it.

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS IN LIVERPOOL.†

DAY OF THE WEEK.	APPREHENSIONS.	
	1905	1904
Sunday	529	505
Monday	1280	1202
Tuesday.. .. .	925	906
Wednesday	764	863
Thursday	705	713
Friday	825	834
Saturday	2482	2585
TOTAL	7510	7608

* *Judicial statistics England and Wales*, 1905, p. 27.

† *Judicial statistics*, 1906, pp. 29 and 30.

A table giving the ages of the persons arrested, also relating to Liverpool, is instructive.*

AGE.	APPREHENSIONS.	
	1905	1904
Under 16	—	1
16 to 21	390	379
21 to 30	2211	2252
30 to 40	2263	2304
40 to 50	1566	1639
50 to 60	666	639
Over 60	424	394

Police Court Magistrates, Judges, and Coroners, whose knowledge and experience entitle their opinions to respect, are unanimous in ascribing to, or associating drink with, much of the crime with which they have to deal.

Mr. Justice Grantham† says:—

Now, apparently, all this is changed. I have lately been brought face to face for weeks with the conduct of publicans in the carrying on of their business, which has resulted in the most heartbreaking crimes it is possible to imagine—husbands murdering their wives, wives their husbands, fathers their sons, friends their own best friends—all through the maddening influence of excessive drinking.

Twelve murders, eighteen attempts at murder, and woundings without number that were just as likely to have ended in murder as far as the conduct of the criminal was concerned, have been mine and my brother Judges' daily fare for the last four weeks in one circuit; and, in almost every case, as appeared in

* *Judicial statistics*, 1906, pp. 29 and 30.

† Letter to Croydon Licensed Victuallers.

evidence, drink was the cause—drink served by publicans and not at clubs, and drink proved to have been served in the public-house, where the man was openly drunk.

Such testimony might be quoted without limit, but two other shortly expressed opinions shall suffice. Lord Chief Justice Coleridge said :—

I can keep no terms with a vice that fills our gaols, that destroys the comfort of homes and the peace of families, and debases and brutalises the people of these islands.

Mr. Coroner Shepherd, of Gateshead, at an inquest he attended in June, 1907, said :—

This is the fourth suicide to-day, and three out of four of these are, there is no doubt, due to drink. Drink, as far as I can see, appears to be at the bottom of these cases of suicide.

DRINK, DISEASE, AND DEATH.

The growing consensus of conviction in the medical profession that alcohol is an important cause of physical degeneration, and that it causes many diseases, and aggravates others is a very impressive fact of recent years.

The attacks by doctors upon drinking have become so general that the “trade” in the early part of 1907 felt it to be necessary to counteract the effect by endeavouring to obtain a manifesto that “the moderate use of alcoholic beverages is, for adults, usually beneficial,” signed by a number of well-known medical men.* The discreditable means

* *Lancet*, March 30th, 1907.

adopted to obtain the signatures were subsequently exposed, and many of the signatories deemed it necessary to explain that they had signed the document under a misapprehension.

We are not here concerned with the debatable question as to whether the "moderate" use of alcohol as an "article of diet for adults is beneficial." There will still remain room for differences of opinion on this point when there is agreement that the extent to which alcohol is consumed by a large portion of our adult population is destructive of physical health. Upon this latter point there can be no two opinions. The facts of everyday life put that beyond the region of controversy.

But a few statements and statistics may be cited to show the extent to which alcohol is responsible for degeneration, disease, and death, and therefore the loss of social wealth. The Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration which sat in 1903, after examining sixty-eight witnesses, reported that:—

The question of drink occupies a prominent place among the causes of degeneration. . . . The tendency of the evidence was to show that drinking habits among the women of the working classes are certainly growing with consequences extremely prejudicial to the care of the offspring, not to speak of the possibility of children being born permanently disabled. . . . The Lunacy figures, which were dealt with by Dr. Jones, show a large, and, in some cases, an increasing number of admissions of both sexes which are due to drink,

and an increase of general paralysis among lunacy patients tells the same tale. . . . As the result of the evidence laid before them, the committee are convinced that the abuse of alcoholic stimulants is a most potent and deadly agent of physical deterioration.

So far back as 1887, a Committee of the British Medical Association enquired into "The Connection of Disease with Habits of Intemperance." The Committee stated its conclusions to be as follows:—

On the whole, then, in addition to the information that we obtain from these returns as to the alcoholic habits of the inhabitants of this country, and as to the relative alcoholic habits of different occupations and classes, we may not unfairly claim to have placed upon a basis of fact the following conclusions.

1. That habitual indulgence in alcoholic liquors beyond the most moderate amounts has a distinct tendency to shorten life, the average shortening being roughly proportional to the degree of indulgence.

2. That of men who have passed the age of twenty-five, the strictly temperate, on the average, live at least ten years longer than those who become decidedly intemperate. (We have not in these returns the means of coming to any conclusion as to the relative duration of life of total abstainers and habitually temperate drinkers of alcoholic liquors.)

A recently published work* deals at length with the pre-natal and after effects of alcohol upon children. It is shown that the alcohol factor in the parents has influence upon the children in four great classes of mental deterioration, namely, (1) idiocy and imbecility,

* *Alcohol and the Human Body*: Sir Victor Horsley and Dr. Mary Sturge.

(2) epilepsy, (3) feeble-mindedness, (4) mental deficiency as shown in school-work.

According to the authority of Drs. Shuttleworth and Fletcher-Beach, parental alcoholism is a factor in 16 per cent. of the cases under their care at the Royal Albert and Darenth Asylum for Idiots and Imbeciles. Analysis of 2,380 of their histories shows that consanguinity, consumption, epilepsy, mental disease, etc., in parents, form other factors, the history of intemperance being associated with one or more of these in the percentage above stated.*

It is shown also that parental alcoholism disposes the offspring to epilepsy. Dr. W. C. Sullivan conducted an investigation which showed that of 219 children who had alcoholic mothers, 4.1 per cent. became epileptic, whereas in the general mass of the population the frequency of epilepsy averages below $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Other writers have found that from 12 to 15 per cent. of the surviving offspring of alcoholics become epileptic.†

In view of the greater attention now being given by educationalists to the treatment of the mentally deficient child, it is well to recognise the effect of alcohol as a factor in the causation of such deficiency. In 1901 a study of the mental deficiency of ordinary children was undertaken for the New York

* *Alcoholism and the Human Body*, p. 321.

† *Ibid.*, p. 322.

Academy of Medicine by Dr. MacNicholl. Fifty-five thousand school children were examined. Of these 58 per cent. were below the required standard of intelligence, 17 per cent. being actual "dullards," 25 per cent. "very deficient," and the other 16 per cent. merely deficient. The habits of the parents with regard to alcohol is reported in 20,147 cases :—

Children of drinking parents..	6624
"	"		reported dullards	53 p.c.
Children of abstaining parents	13523
"	"		reported dullards	10 p.c.

The family histories of 3,711 children were traced through three generations. This was done in great detail with regard to the taking of alcohol. Of the children of abstaining parents and abstaining grandparents, only 4 per cent. were "dullards," whereas of the children of abstaining parents, but drinking grandparents, 78 per cent. were "dullards." Dividing the 3,711 children into two classes, the following results are noted :—

(1) Of those free from hereditary alcoholic taint—

- 96 per cent. were proficient,
- 4 per cent. were dullards,
- 18 per cent. suffered from some neurosis or organic disease.

(2) Of those with hereditary alcoholic taint—

- 23 per cent. were proficient,
- 77 per cent. were dullards,

76 per cent. suffered from neurosis or organic disease.*

The terrible waste of child life is touching the public conscience. While sanitation and the growth of medical science have succeeded in reducing the general death-rate, the appalling mortality among infants has remained practically at the same rate for the last quarter of a century. There are many causes of this loss of infant life—bad housing, ignorance of mother, impure milk, poverty—but it is indisputable that drink contributes considerably to the mortality. The effects of alcoholism in the parent show themselves in many ways upon the children. Professor Bunge, of Bale, has carried out prolonged investigations into the causes of the failure of mothers to suckle their children, and he makes this startling declaration*†:—

There are some cases, and these are not rare, where the mother, having been able to suckle, the daughter has not been able to do so. Here we are close to the causes of the incapacity, and shall FIND IT IN THE FATHER, AND WE AT ONCE ENCOUNTER ALCOHOLISM. In 78 per cent. of these cases, in my statistics, the father is an immoderate drinker. On the other hand, in families where mothers and daughters can suckle their infants, drunkenness is rare; in other words, that the daughter of a drunkard is in a position to be able to properly suckle her infant in a rare case. The rule is that, if the father is a drunkard, the daughter loses her power of suckling.

* *Medical Temperance Review*, August, 1905.

† *Alcoholism and the Human Body*, pp. 325-6.

The spending of any part of the too inadequate income of a working-class family upon drink deprives the mother, and, through her or directly, the child, of necessary food. The mother who drinks is careless and dirty, and her children are neglected. Overlaying of infants is a common cause of death. In London the mean annual number of deaths from overlaying is 612, and the majority of these cases occur on Saturday and Sunday nights—a fact which is obviously suggestive of the cause.

Sir William Broadbent has said: "The worst of it is that for every child that dies, a dozen others are damaged." These "damaged" infant lives grow up physically and mentally incapable of fighting the battle of life. They become the "unemployables" of the labour market, the loafers of our streets, the inmates of our hospitals and prisons, and, instead of being a benefit to the community, they waste its wealth upon their maintenance and propagate their own enfeebled species to be a burden on the next generation. Drink, as a factor in the physique of our population, is too influential to be ignored by the reformer.

Further confirmation of the ravages of Drink, of its influence in wasting human life, is given in the statistics published by the Registrar General and by facts in connection with the experienced Insurance and Friendly Societies.

In 1903 only 1,475 deaths of males and 1,075 of females were returned as caused by alcoholism, and 3,916 deaths from cirrhosis of the liver, a disease known to be nearly always due to drink. These figures, according to Dr. Newsholme,* greatly understate the real number of deaths due to these causes, as it is common for the doctor, out of regard for the feelings of the relatives, not to assign this as the cause of death. Cancer and consumption are responsible for 134 out of every 1,000 deaths recorded, and according to Dr. P. Bronardel, a great French physician, who spoke at the International Congress on Tuberculosis in London in 1902, "Alcoholism is in fact the most powerful factor in the propagation of tuberculosis . . . the returns of mortality from tuberculosis, and the drink bill of France exhibit a strange correspondence." This view was supported by Dr. Koch, of Berlin, and Professor Sims Woodhead, of Cambridge.

The experience of certain Insurance and Friendly Societies which separate abstainers from non-abstainers is often quoted, but it will bear repetition.

* Elements of Vital Statistics.

MORTALITY EXPERIENCE OF FOUR INSURANCE COMPANIES.

	General Section. (Non-Abstainers').			Abstainers' Section.		
	*Ex- pected Deaths	Actual Deaths	Per- cent- age.	Ex- pected Deaths	Actual Deaths	Per- cent- age.
United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution (period 41 years, 1866 to 1906).	13952	13188	95.4	10889	7760	71.2
Spectre Life Associa- tion period of 20 years 1884 to 1906)	2798	2211	79.0	1794	967	53.9
Scottish Temperance Association (period 20 years, 1883 to 1904	319	225	70.5	936	420	44.8
Abstainers' and General (period 23 years 1884 to 1906)	†			956	449	46.5

From the report of the Public Actuary of South Australia, Mr. H. Dillon Gouge, F.S.S., we give the following:—

	Average Rates.	
	Mortality per cent	Sickness Weeks.
Abstainers' Society Average ..	0.689	1.248
Non-Abstainers' Society Average ..	1.381	2.317

* Expected Deaths under H.M. Table of the Institute of Actuaries.

† No figures published.

These figures become the more striking when it is remembered that in the "non-abstainers" societies are many who are in fact abstainers.

The experience of our own country bears out the same conclusions.

On July 17th, 1896, the House of Commons ordered to be printed a special Report on the Sickness and Mortality experienced by the Registered Friendly Societies in the United Kingdom. When the mortality per cent. for all the Friendly Societies is compared with the figures for the Independent Order of Rechabites—an abstainers' society—it is seen that the latter society has a very great advantage.

LUNACY.

Drink, according to the Report of the Commissioners of Lunacy, is one of the chief causes of insanity. The figures for 1904 assign intemperance as the cause of insanity in 22·7 per cent. of the male admissions during five years, and 9·4 of the female; the rates for private patients being, males 16·7, females 8·6; and for pauper patients, males 23·6, and females, 9·6. That drink and insanity are closely associated is shown by Dr. Jones,* the eminent authority on insanity, who records the fact that no less than 42 per cent. of all periodic inebriates relate a history of

* Evidence before Physical Deterioration Committee, Appendix XVI.

either drink, insanity, or epilepsy in their ancestors.

To sum up our indictment of the drink traffic in relation to social waste we submit the foregoing facts to prove that the traffic is largely responsible for murder, suicide, immorality, and petty crimes ; it is poisoning the bodies of the children before they are born ; it sends thousands to the grave before they have learned to lisp ; it gives to tens of thousands who survive a shattered constitution and weakened will ; it pre-disposes them to every form of illness ; it is destroying the capacity for motherhood, and weakening the natural instinct of the mother. It wastes all this human life, and it involves an incalculable loss of social wealth through physical inefficiency, mental incapacity, and loss of self-respecting ambition. It wastes the value of lost time and expense through sickness, and the maintenance of prisons, police courts, homes, and asylums due to drink. Drink is, in fact, one of the most destructive evils, destroying mind and body, which curses the human race.

CHAPTER II.

THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT.

THE origin of the beer drinking customs of the British people is lost in antiquity. Pytheus, the Greek navigator, who visited Britain 330 B.C., tells in his journal that the inhabitants of these islands drank, instead of wine, a fermented liquor made from barley, which they called "curmi."

"In the latter part of the fifteenth century English beer had gained a reputation on the continent and was much exported from England to Flanders. Wherever brewed, it was the favourite beverage of the people, who drank it without stint. 'Barley,' says a physician of this period, 'is the Englishman's vine.' It was a complaint heard more than once that more corn was malted than was eaten for food; for the English, like the other nations of northern Europe, were known as great drunkards."*

In the eighteenth century drunkenness among the upper classes of English Society was universal. The reading of the literature

* Denton's *England in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 204.

of that time leaves one in wonder at the amazing drinking capabilities of the well-known people of that period. Nor was this drinking apparently considered at all reprehensible, but rather an accomplishment for admiration. Addison, Steele, Goldsmith, Parnell, Churchill, were all notoriously drunken, and Lord Bolingbroke, when in office, sat up whole nights drinking, and in the morning, would bind a wet napkin round his forehead and hasten away to his office. In the latter part of the eighteenth century English Society was soaked in drink, the heir-apparent leading the pace. Among the men of this period, Brinsley Sheridan, William Pitt, Lord Chancellor Eldon, Lord Stowell, and Professor Porson, could each empty the contents of six bottles at a sitting, and repeatedly did so! Sir Gilbert Elliott, writing in 1787 expresses his inability to conceive how the men of business and the great orators of the House of Commons continued to reconcile their inordinate consumption of liquor with their Parliamentary duties.

The drunkenness of the upper classes—of royalty, aristocracy, and clergy—set the example to the masses. All the vices of the poor—even to their Toryism—have come down to them from the classes above. It was in the Reign of George I. that the habit of gin drinking took root, and “small as is the place which the fact occupies in English

history, it was probably, if we considered all the consequences which have flowed from it, the most momentous event of the eighteenth century—incomparably more so than any event in the purely political or military annals of the country.’’* The masses of those days put as much enthusiasm into following the example of the upper classes as their descendants of to-day give to the aristocratic vices of gambling and immorality. Distilleries increased in number and taverns were opened everywhere to satisfy and encourage this new popular demand.

When the Industrial Revolution came at the end of that century the masses were helpless before it. They were ignorant, without political power, and without understanding of the meaning of the great economic changes going on. They were easy victims of the free play of competition under which the robust, clear headed men of the age worked the new possibilities of wealth production for their own individual gain. Inhuman conditions of labour, the destruction of the home industries, the driving of the people into the towns, the employment of children and women in the mines and factories, the breaking up of the home, the degradation of the standard of the working class life by the sweeping away of the labour protection statutes, the crushing taxation of the poor,

* Lecky *History of England in the 18th Century*, p. 479.

the general ignorance of sanitary laws, the absence of any real municipal government, the general state of industrial and social chaos from which only a few found it possible to emerge successfully were pre-eminently a state of things calculated to feed the existing appetite for drink. The masses of the people in the industrial towns, physically enervated by their working and social conditions, turned more and more to drink as the only means within their knowledge of drowning their misery.

It is significant of some connection between the increase of drunkenness, or the recognition of the social evil of drunkenness, and the industrial condition of the people, that it was not until one generation had come under the influence of the factory system that the drink question came to be considered so serious as to demand organised effort to combat its ravages. The first Temperance Society was formed in England in 1830, and since then there has been a sustained and widespread temperance work carried on in this country, which for the enthusiasm and devotion of those who have taken part in it has scarcely been equalled, and never surpassed, by any reform movement of the nineteenth century.

The growth of temperance sentiment since 1830 has been remarkable. When the working men of Preston started their Teetotal Society they had no support from clergy,

ministers, or doctors. In 1837 there were but 100 abstinent ministers of religion ; there was no ecclesiastical dignitary favourable to the movement. There were but half-a-dozen known medical men who were abstainers, and every member of Parliament was a non-teetotaller. To-day there are 2,213 branches of the Church of England Temperance Society, and two Archbishops, sixteen home and more colonial Bishops, and lesser dignitaries by the score are professed abstainers. The Nonconformist ministers are, to a great extent, not only personally abstainers, but are active in temperance work. There is a British Medical Temperance Association, including a number of University professors ; and recently 14,718 medical men presented a petition to the Government of the day praying for temperance teaching in the schools. The Army and the Navy have their Temperance Societies, with which many thousands of men are associated. The House of Commons has come under the influence of the extending temperance sentiment, and, to the old members of the House, a most remarkable feature of the present Parliament is the large number of abstaining members and the temperance of the general body. Of the men elected on the 9th November, 1907, to occupy the honoured position of Mayor no less than 64 are proud to be known as total abstainers, and the abstaining Provosts of Scottish burghs number 46. The temperance

bodies calculate that there are 3,000,000 adult persons in the country who are abstainers, and in the juvenile Bands of Hope, of which there are 22,000 societies, there are 3,000,000 children enrolled.

These figures of the extent to which temperance sentiment and abstinence from drink prevail amongst all classes in the community are striking evidence of the public recognition of the drink evil, and of the need for counteracting its ravages by personal example and associated effort. Instead of the teetotaler being an object for pity or contempt, as was the case seventy years ago, the prevailing public sentiment is one of condemnation of drunkenness and respect for the total abstainer.

CHAPTER III.

LABOUR ORGANISATIONS AND DRINK.

THE progress of the Temperance sentiment described in the previous chapter has not been confined to the upper and middle classes. The temperance movement began among the workers. It seems to be the law for vice to descend from the so-called "upper" classes to the so-called "lower," and for virtue to begin among the masses and gradually to ascend to the "classes." There were in the dark days of the early nineteenth century many of the working classes who struggled bravely against the oppressive conditions of their industrial lot. The records of the political agitations of those days, of the beginnings of modern trade unionism and the co-operative and friendly societies, tell how a minority of the poor fought against adversity and succeeded in preventing themselves from being completely debased by the conditions which the majority of their class found too strong to overcome.

The history of the Labour movement in the nineteenth century shows a growing perception by the leaders of the working class emancipa-

tion—the trade unions and the co-operators—of the causes of the people's poverty and of the obstacles hindering the advancement and unity of the workers. At the time when drinking, and even drunkenness were not considered reprehensible, it could not be expected that Labour organisations would be uninfluenced by popular custom. The records of the older trade unions give some interesting references to the drinking which was associated with the trade union meetings. Their lodge meetings were almost invariably held in public houses. Drinking was associated with all the functions and ceremonials of the union meetings. It was the custom of the block printers of Glasgow to exact a fee of seven guineas for each new apprentice, and this money was always straightway drunk by the men of the print field, the employer taking the head of the table, no work being done by any one until the fund was exhausted.*

The same writers say :—†

In the reports and financial statements of the Unions for the first half of the century, drink was one of the largest items of expenditure, express provision being made by the rules for the refreshment of the officers and members at all meetings. The rules of the London Society of Woolstaplers (1813) state that the president shall be accommodated with his own choice of liquors, wine only excepted. . . . The Friendly Society of Ironmoulders (1809) ordains that the Marshall shall distribute the beer round the

* Webb's *History of Trade Unionism*, p. 66.

† Ibid p. 67 and pp. 185-6.

meeting impartially, members being forbidden to drink out of turn except the officers at the table or a member on his first coming to town. Even as late as 1837 the rules of the Steam Engine Makers' Society direct one third of the weekly contribution to be spent in the refreshment of members, a provision which drops out in 1846. In that year the delegate meeting of the Ironmoulders prohibited drinking and smoking at its meetings, and followed up this self-denying ordinance by altering the rules of the Society so as to change the allowance of beer at branch meeting to its equivalent in money. 'We believe,' they declared, 'the business of the Society would be much better done were there no liquor allowance.' . . . By 1860 most of the larger Societies had abolished all allowance for liquor, and some have even prohibited its consumption during business meetings. It is to be remembered that the Unions had, at first, no other meeting place than the club room, freely placed at their disposal by the publican, and that their payment for drink was of the nature of rent. Meanwhile the Compositors and Bookbinders were removing their headquarters from public-houses to offices of their own, and the Steam Engine Makers were allowing branches to hire rooms for meetings, so as to avoid temptation. In 1850 the Ironmoulders report that some publicans were refusing to lend rooms for meetings, owing to the growth of Temperance.

The last words of the foregoing sentence are significant. They indicate the spread of temperance principles, which had been a feature of the whole trade union movement for some few years previous to that date (1850).

The Co-operative movement began at a later period than trade unionism, and in its inception and early stages it benefited from

the growing popular sentiment against intemperance, which had been affecting the more active of the working classes. The Rochdale Pioneers, who were Owenites, Chartists and teetotallers, put forward as one of their objects, that for "the promotion of sobriety, a temperance hotel should be opened as soon as convenient." The Co-operative movement has kept itself free from association with liquor, and this is all the more indicative of a strong belief in the ruinous character of drunkenness, when it is remembered how the sale of drink would have added to the dividends of the non-drinking membership.

The growth of temperance sentiment in the working class movements continued, and within the last few years the Labour movement has taken an increasingly aggressive attitude against the drink traffic. As far back as 1893, nearly 200 Labour leaders, comprising all the most prominent trade unionists of that day, replied in a public manifesto to the charge that licensing legislation would interfere with the liberties of the working classes. Speaking of the Bill introduced in that year to establish the principle of "popular control," they said that the opponents of that measure "profess to be intensely interested in the protection of the liberties of the working classes. It is a fraudulent profession. The liberty which most of them really desire to maintain is the liberty of privileged monopolists to exploit the work-

ing classes, and to draw and suck from them their money by indirect means. 'Liberty of the people!' Could any cry be more absurd? . . . As at least six-sevenths of all entitled to vote belong to what are called 'the poorer classes,' it is sheer mockery and insult of the monopolists to tell them that the measure will enable the rich to tyrannise over them." Trade Union officials have seen so much of the evils of drunkenness among the workers; they have seen how drink so often frustrates their efforts to gain improvements; they have seen how important it is that the leaders of the working men should have clear heads, and should set an example in sobriety and self-restraint, that the men appointed to the secretaryships of the great unions, within recent years, are almost without exception total abstainers. Every man who has occupied the chair of the Trade Union Congress for the last six years has been a total abstainer. Of the 30 Labour and Socialist members returned to Parliament at the election of 1906, the majority are total abstainers.

When the Trade Union Congress met at Leeds in 1904, there was formed a "Trade Union and Labour Officials' Temperance Fellowship." In the three years of its existence this body has done good work in seeking to obtain facilities for the meetings of trade union lodges away from public houses. The Right Hon. Thomas Burt, speaking at one of

the meetings of this Fellowship said that when he became secretary of the Northumberland Miners' Association, forty-one years ago, nearly all the lodges of the union met in public houses, and although they had quadrupled the number of their branches, not a single lodge meeting was now held on licensed premises. Mr. A. H. Gill, M.P., the Secretary of the Bolton Cotton Spinners, at a meeting of the Fellowship held during the Congress at Bath, in 1907, made the even more remarkable statement that in his own society five years ago he believed every branch meeting was held at a public house, while now 30 per cent. of the meetings were held in places where no drink was sold.

"I have known the time" said Mr. W. C. Steadman, M.P., the Secretary to the Trade Union Congress "when a resolution dealing with the Temperance Question was ruled out of order and cut off the Conference Agenda." Times have changed in Trade Unionism since then. At the Congress of 1906 a resolution was passed instructing the Committee to endeavour to get from the Local Government Board facilities for Trade Union Meetings being held in the local Municipal rooms. The Labour Party, to which 1,000,000 Trade Unionists are affiliated, has on several occasions passed strong resolutions upon the Temperance Question.

At the London Conference in 1906 a resolu-

tion in the following terms was carried by 600,000 votes for, to 103,000 against.

It being admitted by judges, magistrates, chief constables, poor law administrators, governors of gaols and lunatic asylums, ministers of religion of all denominations, and social workers generally, that the liquor traffic is a fruitful source of poverty, crime and lunacy, this conference is of opinion that the time has arrived when the workers of the nation should demand that a law be enacted giving the inhabitants of every locality the right to veto any application for either the renewal of existing licenses, or the granting of new ones, seeing that the public-houses are generally situated in thickly-populated working-class districts.

Twelve months later the Conference at Belfast showed a further advance of opinion. The Chairman of the Congress (Mr. J. J. Stephenson, A.S.E.), in his Presidential Address said :—

There is the Temperance question to settle. The Labour movement had every sympathy with legitimate Temperance reform. We expect no mercy from the brewers and the publicans, and we have no alliance with them. A sober nation is the best nation to solve its political problems.

At a later stage of the Conference a resolution in the following terms was carried without a division and with acclamation.

That any measure of Temperance reform should confer upon localities full and unfettered power for dealing with the licensing question in accordance with local opinion. By this means localities should be enabled to—

- (a) Prohibit the sale of liquor within their boundaries;
- (b) Reduce the number of licenses and regulate the conditions under which they may be held; and

- (c) If a locality decides that licenses are to be granted, to determine whether such licenses shall be under private or any form of public control.

In the course of the debate upon this resolution Mr. Jas. Sexton, the General Secretary of the Dock Labourers' Union said, "There was nothing hampered the Labour Party more than the accursed drink. It was responsible for more degradation and ignorance than all the other enemies of the movement put together."

The charge is often made against the Socialists that they ignore the importance of the Drink Curse, and relegate it to a mere trivial issue of the capitalistic system. The Independent Labour Party, which is the chief Socialist body in Britain, contains among its membership a larger proportion of abstainers than any other political organisation in the country. Drink is sold in less than three per cent. of its clubs, and the Annual Conferences of the Party have passed resolutions deploring the association of drink even to this extent with the movement. The party has its Temperance programme, and the subject of the legislative aspect of the question is frequently treated at its public meetings and debates.

The continental Socialists are alive to the hindrance which drink is to the progress of Socialist ideas. For years the great leaders of Belgian, Swiss, and Austrian Socialism—

M. Vandervelde, Dr. Otto Lang, and Dr. Victor Adler have been energetic Temperance advocates, the first-named delivering a powerful appeal for Temperance from the Socialist standpoint at the Seventh International Congress against Alcoholism at Paris. In 1903 the Congress of the Austrian Socialist Party passed a resolution against alcoholism, and similar resolutions have been passed by Congresses of the Belgian, Scandinavian, Swiss, and German Socialists. The German trade unions have repeatedly passed resolutions against drinking. The following is the text of the resolution on drinking passed at the German Socialist Congress at Essen in September, 1907.*

There is a rapidly growing sentiment against alcohol among the continental Socialists. The young men who are coming into the movement are mainly abstainers. This is due largely to the example of the leaders who lay great and constant stress upon the fact that the workers need all their powers in the fight for Socialism, and point out that alcohol diminishes the fighting power of the workman, which is in the brain, for alcohol is a brain poison. There are Socialist Temperance Societies in Sweden, Germany, Austria and Belgium. Selling of alcohol in Socialist clubs is prohibited by resolution of the Con-

* The full text of the resolution, and of the Austrian resolution also is printed in Appendix I.

gress, and this prohibition is generally recognised. The famous Maison du Peuple at Brussels sells tea, coffee, beer, wine, but no spirits. At the Workers' Congress at Brussels in 1907, an anti-alcohol resolution was passed, and a Bureau was instructed to gather information from the various countries as to the ravages of Drink, and this information was to be disseminated among the Socialists of the several nations.

The first step to reform is an awakened conscience as to the need of reform. The next is an understanding of the nature of the problem to be treated. The facts given in this and the preceding chapter furnish evidence of the awakening of the public conscience and of the Labour and Socialist movement to the need of dealing with the curse of intemperance.

CHAPTER IV.

WHO CONSUMES THE DRINK ?

IN his letter to the *Times* on National Expenditure on Drink for 1906 Dr. Dawson Burns says, "There is a greatly increasing number who seldom use any intoxicating liquor." These remarks are embodied in a statement that in the year 1906 the sum of £166,425,911 was spent on drink by some of the people of the United Kingdom. This represents an expenditure per head of the population of £3 16s. 3d. The corresponding figure for the year 1842 was £2 8s. 5½d. These figures apparently contradict the assumption that temperance has made great progress during the past sixty years. Contrasting the expenditure for 1906 with that of 1886 and 1896 we find. Expenditure upon drink per head of the population :—

1886	£3 6 10
1896	£3 15 6
1906	£3 16 3

Neither do these figures carry on their faces a confirmation of the claim that a "greatly

increasing number seldom use any alcoholic liquor." But the facts set forth in the two preceding chapters and the statement of Dr. Dawson Burns are undoubtedly true notwithstanding. There arises, therefore, the difficult task of reconciling temperance progress and an increased expenditure upon liquor.

In each of the years 1900-1905 the drink bill showed a successive reduction amounting in the aggregate to £21,759,286, or taking the increase of population into account, a reduction of £33,844,554.

The decline was arrested in 1906, but to such a small extent as not to warrant any conclusions therefrom. It is doubtful if we should be justified in concluding from the figures 1900-1905 that a decline had set in which was going to continue. A glance at the Drink Bill for each of the years since 1837 makes one hesitate to come to such a conclusion, even from the satisfactory figures of the six years, 1900-1905. The eight years, 1879-1888, were years of rapid decrease in the Drink Bill, which brought down the expenditure per head from £4 4s. 1d. in 1877, to £3 6s. 8d. in 1888.

The explanation of the apparent contradictions of more teetotallers and very moderate drinkers against an expenditure which is larger per head than sixty years ago is we think to some extent set forth by Mr. (now Sir) T. P. Whittaker, in his *Economic Aspect of the*

Drink Problem (p. 17) :—

In my opinion the true explanation of what is considered to be the greater sobriety of the people is to be found in another direction. There is more drinking now than there was sixty or eighty years ago. But it is of a different kind. It is more frequent and regular. There is less obvious intoxication, but there is more soaking. There is less reeling drunkenness, less evident excess, and, consequently, there are fewer cases in the police courts, and fewer guests under the dinner table. But, taking the year round, more liquor is swallowed. There have been great changes in manners and customs in this respect during the last hundred years, but they have not affected for the better the quantity consumed. Habitual drinking, continual and frequent, has taken the place of occasional bouts of brutal drunkenness.

It is true, we believe, that drinking by those who do take liquor, is more frequent and regular, and this is the outcome of the changed conditions of employment. The discipline of the factory and workshop, a discipline which is every year getting more strict, tends to compel greater sobriety among the factory and workshop hands during working hours. The practice of "breaking time," of keeping "St. Monday," has greatly diminished during the last twenty-five years as every employer of labour will bear testimony.* The conditions of present-day machine-using industries insist upon attendance during the fixed hours of work. Where work is not done on the premises of the employer, or where the workman can by the nature of his occupation

* For further testimony on this point see Appendix II.

to some extent regulate his hours, there is more opportunity for frequent libations. We believe that while drinking has declined among those who are under the discipline of the well organised industries, there has been a corresponding increase in the expenditure upon drink among the working and commercial classes who have a freer disposal of their working hours. In support of this theory we may quote some figures which show how largely in recent years that class has grown which has command of its own time and to which the temptations of drinking are open every hour of the day.

In proportion to the population the number of persons employed in factories and workshops has been getting less for the past forty years. Indeed, in the trades where machinery is most extensively employed in production, the number of workers is actually less than was the case fifty years ago. The following figures, based on the census reports, are interesting :

Trades.	Persons occupied, including Employees and Dealers.		Total Population.	
	1851	1901	1851	1901
Textile ..	1,671,681	1,301,685	27,745,949	41,454,758
Tailoring, Boot & Shoe	504,072	599,409		

There has been a large increase in the number of persons employed in certain other occupations where the conditions of employ-

ment demand unbroken attendance during working hours, namely, in the engineering and shipbuilding trades, the railways, tramways and mining. The building trade shows an increase of over fifty per cent. in the last fifty years, though this trade is not to anything like the same extent under the strict discipline as to regularity of attendance as are the factory and workshop trades. But taking those occupations which may be considered as coming within the category of the directly disciplined trades, we get approximately the following increases in the employees in the last fifty years :—

		Persons Employed.	
		In 1851.	In 1901.
Mining, etc.	620,000	906,541
Engineering, etc.	504,968	1,435,835
Domestic Service	1,093,870	1,641,154
Railways, Tramways, &c.	400,000	1,573,367

If we add to this number the textile and boot and shoe trades, and the lesser factory and workshop industries, we may safely conclude that 10,000,000, out of 16,000,000 occupied persons in the United Kingdom are working under the strict discipline of industrial direction, and have no opportunities for drinking during working hours, and are liable to dismissal for absenting themselves from work to drink.

Of the industrial population this is the section which probably is most temperate. It is

when we consider the nature of the employment of the remaining 6,000,000 that we find at least some plausible explanation of the apparent contradiction between increased general sobriety and an increased expenditure on drink.

The number of persons employed in what are called in the North of England "the loose-end" occupations is increasing beyond the increase of any other class. Since 1861 the total number of occupied persons has increased by 53 per cent., while the number of the "commercial" class has risen in the period by 200 per cent.! Between 1891 and 1900 the number of persons supposed to be earning a living as merchants, brokers, agents, factors, dealers, salesmen, buyers, commercial travellers, and other "loose-end" occupations, approximately increased 50 per cent. We have mentioned already the great increase in the number returned as belonging to the building trade, and there are other manual labour occupations where the discipline is easy, which show considerable increases also. We will now summarise the numbers of the class with which we are now dealing :—

Commercial	2,000,000
Carmen and Waggoners and other Road Workers	500,000
Building Trades	1,000,000
Agriculture	2,000,000
General Labourers	700,000
	<hr/>
	6,200,000

Taking out of this list the agricultural workers, we see that all the rest have occupations which bring them into constant contact with the temptations of the public-house and the social drinking customs which are responsible for so much senseless drinking. The nature of the occupations will not permit of protracted drinking, but, in the place of that, the practice is frequent single drinks, with the result that there is little gross intoxication, because the drinks do not follow each other in sufficiently rapid succession.

There is greater sobriety, there is less drink consumed among the factory and workshop population, and the total expenditure on drink is maintained by the classes with leisure, or who have constant opportunities and temptations to drink. The section whose occupations fall under the description of "commercial" probably consume more liquor per head than any other section of the community.

The theory we have been endeavouring to establish is supported by the experience of the last few years. These have been years of great prosperity in the textile, iron, and coal trades. But there has been no increase in the consumption of drink. This fact, we submit, is a strong confirmation of the theory that the bulk of the expenditure on drink is made by the other sections to whom we have attributed it. Further confirmation is given by the statements in a letter from an excise

supervisor at Leeds, which was read to the House of Commons by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on April 15th, 1905. Speaking of the way in which the factory and workshop people spend their Bank Holiday, he said :—

Instead of spending their wages in public-houses they take advantage of cheap excursions. . . . To verify certain statements I visited several licensed houses on August Bank Holiday and found them all practically empty. On visiting the railway station I noticed every excursion train was packed. Similar reports reach me from other places.

If the theory we have tried to establish is sound, it will have an important bearing upon proposals of temperance reform.

There is one other painful explanation which is put forward to account in some measure for the sustained expenditure upon drink, namely, the increase of drinking among women. It seems to be universally accepted as a fact that such is the case. Statistics certainly appear to support the statement.

DEATH RATES FROM INTEMPERANCE (CHRONIC ALCOHOLISM AND DELIRIUM TREMENS) PER MILLION LIVING.

	1876-81	1881-85	1886-90	1891-95	1896-99
Males	60	66	74	86	100
Females ..	24	31	40	50	60

In twenty-three years there has been an increase of 150 per cent. for females.

In 1907 a White Paper was presented to Parliament giving information obtained from certain police forces as to the Frequenting of Public Houses by Women and Children. The

report gives some appalling facts. We append a summary of the returns.

PLACE.	Number of Houses Observed.	Number of Days Observed.	Number of Women and Children entering.		AGE OF CHILDREN.
			Women	Children	
Birmingham ..	10	16	—	2949	Nearly all under six, remainder under eleven.
Bristol	472	14.	—	2441	1849 under 5.
Liverpool	9	8	7800	316	75 in arms, rest under 8.
London	23	4	39541	10746	1164 in arms rest under 16
Manchester ..	24	12	—	8973	6471 under 5
Sheffield	6	14	1054	1181	All under 6.

The causes of the increased drinking among women are somewhat obscure. The sale of drink by grocers is frequently ascribed as a reason. We would suggest that the tendencies of modern industry have some bearing upon the matter. The number of women who have to struggle against men in the labour market for a living is rapidly growing. In 1901 there were nearly three millions of women and girls working in industrial occupations other than domestic service. In so far as industrial conditions are responsible for drinking among men, it will follow that when women are subjected to the same influences and temptations they are likely to do the same. Superstitions linger longer among women, and the

value of alcohol as a restorative, which formerly was so generally believed, is still widespread among them. Women, from physiological causes, are more subject to nervous diseases, and when their conditions of life are unhealthy, and the temptations of drink are before them, there is the probability they may succumb to the temptation.

CHAPTER V.

THE CAUSES OF DRINKING.

To diagnose accurately a case is more difficult than to know how to treat it successfully. Similar symptoms may arise from a variety of causes, and the same cause may give rise to a variety of symptoms. The elaborate and intricate interplay of causes and of cause and effect has also to be considered. In social questions especially, there is an intimate connection all round, and in no one instance can treatment be successfully applied without regard to the relation of the particular case to other industrial and social conditions.

Since the Temperance movement began there has been wonderful progress made in what we may call the scientific method of treating social questions. The empirical and revolutionary ways of treating effects have been superseded by the diagnostic and evolutionary methods. Seventy years of added experience of the working of the capitalist system have taught us much of its character, its tendencies, and its effects. The discovery

of the law of evolution has modified former ideas, and the experience of attempts to stamp out one evil only to find another rising in its place has taught us that the hydra-headed monster we call the Social Problem is not to be destroyed by cutting off its heads one by one.

The ideals held, in the early days of the Temperance agitation both of the character of the drink evil and of the treatment of it, are well expressed in the objects of the United Kingdom Alliance, namely, "total abstinence for the individual and prohibition for the State." The simplicity of this method of abolishing drunkenness and drink was due to the belief that the only cause of drinking was the existence of the facilities to drink. It indicates a faith in the power of the individual to resist the influence of drink, or failing that, it demands the removal of the temptation, when apparently the desire for drink will disappear. If the problem were so simple as that we should be much nearer the teetotal millennium than we are to-day.

The advantages and benefits of personal abstinence are so obvious that if there were not some strong reason why people drink, one would think that abstinence "for the individual" would be the universal rule. It is not enough to offer the common excuse that people drink "because they like it." This only gets us to the further question, "Why do

people like drink?" The liking for drink is not a natural one, but an acquired one. Once begun, the practice of taking alcohol is continued in moderation under the belief that it warms, comforts, refreshes and benefits. Like all drugs, it creates an appetite for itself; the habit of drinking becomes confirmed; it becomes master of the man. Men "like it" because it gives the pleasure of satisfaction—but not of a natural but an artificial desire.

So long as the people live unnatural lives, they will have unnatural cravings—excessive tea drinking, the taste for highly seasoned foods, gambling, love of sensationalism, all arise from the same causes as the desire and liking for alcohol. It is because there are causes of drinking apart from the presence of the public house that the appeal for total abstinence for the individual has not obtained greater response. So long as this craving for exhilaration and restoratives exists, it will find some other way of satisfaction if it cannot be gratified by alcohol.

It is the fact that there are causes of the drink appetite which has rendered the appeal to the individual so often ineffective, and this is also responsible for the failure to realise the second part of the Alliance's object. Prohibition by the State must depend upon the will of the people in a democratic country, and it cannot be expected that the persons who refuse to apply prohibition in their

individual capacity will be willing as citizens to impose it upon themselves and all others.

We must get deeper than the mere presence of the public house to find the causes of drinking. The influences which drive men to drink are many and varied. When Socialist propaganda first boldly attacked the position of the orthodox teetotallers, and, if the whole truth must be told, somewhat rudely and without qualification, reversed the theory of the cause of poverty by denying that poverty was caused by drinking and asserting that poverty was the cause of drinking, the temperance party, being human after all and therefore liable to intemperance—with equal audacity maintained that poverty had nothing at all to do with causing drunkenness. But time has brought both parties to recognise that there is a sufficient foundation of truth in each contention to excuse each party having, without full investigation, raised its contention to the dignity of an explanatory theory.

So long as the Temperance Party and Socialists were in direct conflict, each refusing to concede anything of the other's contention, there was a regrettable weakening of effort both for temperance and social reform work. The Socialist looked upon Temperance work as useless, as a mere cutting of the weeds or covering of the sores. "Capitalism, not drink, is the enemy. It is no use trying to

make men sober. It cannot be done so long as wage slavery exists. If it could, it would but make men more profitable machines for exploitation. We may lessen drinking by bettering the conditions of labour and life, but direct temperance reform is useless and wasted effort." When the Socialist attitude to the drink question was stated in such a repulsive way as that, and when so much time was spent by Socialists in demonstrating that total abstinence would tend to lower wages, and generally in a way which left the impression that men should drink to keep up wages, it is no wonder that the men who knew the awful daily devastation wrought by the drink traffic refused to concede that anything could be more important than abolishing this evil.

Each party has now modified its attitude, and each recognises the essential claim of the other's position, namely, that while there is an intimate connection between poverty and drink, and that while poverty causes drinking, drinking aggravates poverty and in many individual cases is the cause of it.

But much of the criticism to which the Socialist contention that poverty is the main cause of drinking is subjected shows an ignorance of what Socialists mean by poverty in this connection. Even the Right Hon. John Burns, whose former intimate acquaintance with Socialist phraseology ought to have saved him from committing the error, puts

upon the word the very narrowest construction. In his Raper-Lees lecture, *Labour and Drink*,* he spends a considerable time in endeavouring to shake the theory that poverty causes drinking. He points to instances where a rise of wages has been followed by increased drunkenness and more criminal disorder, and to cases where wages are low and sobriety general. But if the right hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to understand the theory he endeavoured to disprove he would have spared himself much labour in collecting extracts, and would have saved himself from the humiliation of attempting, but signally failing, to disprove a theory which he immediately afterwards accepted and made the basis of his proposals of temperance reform.

No Socialist limits the meaning of the word poverty to the amount of wages a person receives. By poverty is meant low wages in so far as they are inadequate to provide for the satisfaction of healthy wants, but included in the meaning of the word are the conditions under which the wage is earned—long hours, insanitary conditions, exhausting and mechanical toil—bad housing, bad food, bad cooking, lack of home comforts—often through the wife working—lack of education, an inability to take an interest in elevating things or healthy pastimes, the worry and

* Pages 12, 13, and 14.

uncertainty and struggle of present day life. By poverty as a factor in the drink question Socialists mean the results of commercialism and competition upon the lives of the people.

The statistics and facts given in the lecture by Mr. John Burns, for the purpose of proving that poverty does not cause drinking, prove the very opposite with overwhelming force. The figures are given as to the arrests for drunkenness in Liverpool in each day of the week, and the particulars as to the occupations of the persons arrested. Quite naturally the busiest time for policemen is the week-end, and, as one would expect, 1,905 out of 2,694 cases of drunkenness are labourers, sailors, firemen, and carters. Three-quarters of the persons arrested belong to the very poorest, hardest-worked and worst treated classes of the community. Why should this class, though small in proportion to the total population of the city furnish three-quarters of the cases of drunkenness? The right hon. gentleman says "these facts go to prove that possession of means causes drunkenness." If the possession of "means" is responsible for driving the labourer to drink, why does not the possession of larger means drive other classes to drink in equal proportions? The lecturer himself supplies the answer and at the same time demolishes his own contention. "Surely this proves," he says, "that the people perish for lack of knowledge, absence of self-

respect, lowness of aim, the fewness of their wants, the sordid level of their appetites." And this is what Socialists mean by poverty.

To reply to the contention that poverty causes drinking, by pointing to instances where men with high wages drink, and to others where men with low wages are sober, is no valid answer. It is not so much the money amount of the wages as the conditions under which the wage is earned and the outside opportunities and associations of the individual. If a man or a class "lack knowledge, self-respect and loftiness of aim," the higher the wages of their labour, the more they will spend in satisfying their "sordid appetites." It is precisely what one would expect, that times of good trade and higher wages are characterised by an increased expenditure upon drink. The higher wages have come, but the wisdom to spend them wisely has lingered, and the increase of wages is too often spent in ways which injure rather than bless. The cause is poverty—poverty of knowledge.

It should be remembered, too, that the higher wages earned under good trade are obtained at the cost of greater effort, and the working hours are often longer and the intensity of the strain greater. This leads to greater physical exhaustion, and to drink for stimulation. The cause is poverty—poverty of leisure, poverty of knowledge.

Opposites often produce similar results. Too much work brings physical exhaustion, and weakens the moral strength, produces, in short, a state where the individual falls an easy prey to temptations to drink. Too little work encourages laziness, weakens the moral force, and produces a similar condition to that just described. Nothing is more speedily destructive of effort to rise superior to one's condition than the apparent hopelessness of success. The instability and irregularity of employment in these days, which affect more or less the whole of our wage-earning population, are responsible for the loss of much of the self-respect and lack of ambition which characterise so many of the masses. Nine-tenths of the wage-earning population are working on engagements which may be terminated at a week's, a day's, an hour's notice. The average working man has in grim fact "no abiding city here."

The influences which under the general term of poverty we have described as tending to cause drinking, are by no means confined in their operation to the wage-earning class. Every section of the community, from the richest to the poorest, are influenced in their lives, characters, tastes, vices, and indulgences by the spirit of the age. Very often it is pointed out, as a score against the contention that poverty causes drink, that the middle-classes and the rich also drink, though they

are not poor. There never was an age in which riches were the associate of poverty to the extent to which they are in our own. "The bankrupt century" Carlyle called the nineteenth century. Yes, bankrupt in idealism, in morality, in its valuation of human life, and in conception of everything which makes a nation great. "The great cry which rises from all our manufacturing cities, louder than their furnace blast, is in very deed for this,—that we manufacture everything there except men; we blanch cotton, and strengthen steel, and refine sugar, and shape pottery; but to brighten, strengthen, to refine, or to form a single living spirit, never enters into our estimate of advantages."* In this sordid age of materialism when not alone do the labourer, the fireman, the sailor, and the carter lack a lofty ideal, poverty curses the rich equally as it destroys the poor.

The anxiety and worry of business, its increasingly speculative and risky character, the hurry and anxiety to get rich, are unnerving our commercial classes and driving them to drink and suicide. The rich upper classes are as enervated and demoralised by idleness and luxury as are the middle classes by worry and hurry and the workers by the conditions of their existence. The influences which are responsible for drinking among the upper and middle classes arise from the

* Ruskin : *Nature of Gothic*, p. 15.

same root causes as the influences which encourage the masses to drink.

It is scarcely necessary to qualify the foregoing statements by mentioning that not all the individuals who compose the respective classes fall under the influences which others do not or cannot resist. It is perfectly true that very many men of all classes, business men with heavy responsibilities, and workmen who toil hard and long for small wages do not fall victims to drink. Every man's environment is a combination of innumerable influences—some degrading, some exalting. Every man varies in the strength of his power to resist and to select. An open sewer is a possible source of infection to a whole village, but only a few fall victims to smallpox or typhoid. A disease attacks and overcomes those who are constitutionally most susceptible. So with the drink craving. In the conditions of modern life, drink is a danger to everybody, but it is a blessed thing that there are counter influences which in so many cases save men from its allurements.

CHAPTER VI.

SOCIAL CONDITIONS AND DRINKING.

THE Socialist contention that industrial and social conditions have much to do with the drinking habits of the people is now very generally accepted. Medical men, Royal Commissioners, social workers, housing reformers, educationalists, labour leaders—all admit that drink and poverty, in the wide sense of the word, are intimately associated.

The Right Hon. John Burns,* after expending much effort to deny the connection between poverty and drink, indicts a number of industrial occupations as “liquor-cursed trades.” “All dusty, dirty, disagreeable occupations that are carried on in hot places,” he says, “predispose to drink. . . . Can you wonder at them flying to drink? Let the Rev. R. J. Campbell, or the Archbishop of Canterbury,” he continues, “work in a black ash shed, in a dilapidated hovel, in a stink-house yard, next door to a railway arch, with a bone factory next door and a guano factory over the way, and they would both become chronic dipsomaniacs.”

* Lees-Raper Lecture.

The deplorable increase of drinking among women—with its terrible consequences upon child-life and the future of the race—is attributed, to a considerable extent, to working and home conditions. Sir Lauder Brunton, physician at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, speaking at the Conference on Child Mortality,* said :—

Why do mothers go to the public house? A penny-worth of gin means much more to the mother than mere gin. In many cases it means light and warmth that the mother cannot get in her own poor house. How are we to supply this want so that we shall not do the mothers and children harm by excluding them from the public houses? Let us supply them with places where they can go and get for a penny warm cocoa or coffee and a bit of bread with the warmth they desire. . . .The mothers must have a more decent home life, and live in more sanitary surroundings.

Dr. Sheridan Delepine, Director of the Public Health Laboratory, Manchester, also declares his conviction that the home life of the poor wife is in cases responsible for drinking.†

The curse of drink is not confined to the public house, it follows the mother to her miserable home. A poor woman with a large family in the midst of sordid poverty, from which there seems no possible escape, must ultimately lose hope for better things, become reckless in her actions as a drowning man in his movements.

Medical testimony of a similar nature could

* *Tribune*, March 4th, 1907.

† *Ibid*.

be quoted without limit, all going to prove it is the conviction of the men who, by training and the experience of their daily work, are qualified to be heard on this question—that the poverty and sordid conditions, and ignorance, strongly pre-dispose to drink among women. Industrial conditions are also responsible for the increase of drinking among women. The Report of the Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration* states that in Nottingham, where so many women are employed in lace factories, twice as many women as men are received into the Asylum whose insanity is ascribed to drink.

Whatever conditions, whether they be in the factory or workshop, in the home or in the surroundings, which tend to enfeeble the health of the people, encourage indulgence in drink. The ill-nurtured child which survives to manhood has a constitution which is incapable of offering resistance to disease, and to temptation to indulgence.† The housing and insanitary surroundings of a large proportion of our population necessarily have the effect of impairing the vitality of this part of our race. A report presented to the Liverpool City Council on January 14th, 1904, pointed

* *Report* par. 170.

† People who have not food enough turn to drink to satisfy their cravings, and also to support their enfeebled hearts by alcohol. Dr. Niven, *Physical Deterioration Report*, p. 30.

out that, while the general death-rate for the city is about 22 per 1,000 per annum, in certain areas the rate rises to 63 per 1,000, and in another case even to 83. The Report of the Medical Officer to the London County Council for 1903 draws attention to the wide disparity between the health of two areas within the county. He says:—

Comparing males in the two communities, out of 1,000 born in Southwark, 326 die before reaching five years of age; while in Hampstead, out of 1,000 born, only 189 die before reaching the age of five years. Again, out of a 1,000 children aged five in Southwark, 40 die before reaching the age of 15; while in Hampstead the corresponding number is 24. At ages 25-45, when probably, so far as the community is concerned, the economic value of life is at a maximum, the differences in the two communities is most marked. Thus, of 1,000 males aged 25 living in Southwark, 236 die before reaching the age of 45 years; while the corresponding figure for Hampstead is only 125.

The explanation of the difference in mortality is to be found in the fact that in Southwark over 70 per cent. of the population were living in small tenements, while in Hampstead less than 30 per cent. were so housed; in Southwark nearly 10 per cent. were housed in one-roomed tenements, while in Hampstead this proportion was only 2 per cent. In Finsbury, where the population of one-roomed tenements is 14,516, the death-rate per 1,000 in 1903 was 38·9, yet the rate among occupants of four rooms, or more, was only 5·6.

The Royal Commission on Housing pointed out the connection between bad housing and drink. They said that the evils of drink, overcrowding and poverty, act and re-act on each other. Lord Shaftesbury said (*Report* p. 15) "I am certain the people who are in that condition have been made so by the condition of the houses in which they live."

The Committee on Physical Deterioration, quoting from Booth's *Life and Labour in London* say, "Drink is fostered by bad houses; crowded homes send men to the public-house; crowding [is] the main cause of drink and vice." Dr. T. W. Hime, formerly Medical Officer of Health for the City of Bradford, in a lecture on the Housing question delivered on November 27th, 1896, said:—

He had no doubt that thousands of slum dwellers resorted to the use of stimulants to brace themselves up in a morning, because under the conditions under which they lived they had not been able to obtain a sufficiently refreshing sleep; and he urged that it could scarcely be a matter for surprise that they should prefer the comfort of the public house to their own homes. If those who were richer and better educated were exposed to a tithe of the temptations of these poor people, we should find probably that they offered less resistance to these temptations. The wonder was that under these conditions the poor preserved their virtues to the extent they did.

The evil of bad housing and insanitation is not confined to the towns, but it is working ruin and driving to drink in the less thickly populated areas. A very striking description

of the state of a colliery village in Co. Durham is quoted* by Mr. Fred Topham, who is Agent to the United Kingdom Alliance for the North Eastern district, and who is the most orthodox of temperance men :—

The first thing that strikes one in viewing Chopwell is that such a splendid opportunity should have been lost of creating a model village. Chopwell is a modern colliery village, set amidst most beautiful surroundings. Civilisation has toiled on through the ages, and offers THIS as her latest contribution to progress! Squalor prevails everywhere; the streets are a disgrace—in truth, being little better than bogs. Decent people can with difficulty live there and remain decent, being placed alongside of degenerate neighbours, and witnessing rows and disgusting affrays nightly in the streets.

No one takes an interest in the place; it is left to work out its own salvation alone. There is no social life, few amusements of any worth. Amidst such lack of interest and squalor, it is not surprising that the miner finds his Mecca in the large 'Chopwell Hotel.' Friday night is one vast orgy; money is literally thrown about. The great difficulty is to find change for the gold sovereigns, of which I am told £270 are changed on a single pay night. The street reeks of beer.

Though the town is placed high up in a beautiful airy country, the health bill is deplorable; consumption is frequent, typhoid seldom absent, large numbers always on the sick list. Excuses are vain. As a product of modern civilisation, where the most favourable conditions were afforded, it stands condemned.

The Housing conditions in Co. Durham are notoriously bad, both in the colliery villages

* *Public House Trusts*, p. 26.

and in the large towns. The county of Glamorgan has an equally bad pre-eminence. It is instructive to compare the convictions for drunkenness in these two counties with the figures for the North Riding of Yorkshire and Devonshire, two adjacent counties :—

	Convictions for Drunkenness per 10,000 of population		
DURHAM—			
County Petty Sessional Divisions	115
YORKSHIRE, NORTH RIDING—			
County Petty Sessional Divisions	38
GLAMORGAN—			
County Petty Sessional Division (including two small Boroughs)	164
DEVONSHIRE—			
County Petty Sessional Divisions	27

To emphasise further the connection between Housing and Intemperance we have compiled the following table showing the proportion of convictions for drunkenness and the percentage of overcrowding in the following towns :—

	Total number of persons overcrowded	Percentage of total population	Convictions for drunkenness per 10,000 of population	
Sunderland	.. 43,976	.. 30'1	..	104
Newcastle 65,605	.. 30'5	..	137
Tynemouth	.. 15,777	.. 30'7	..	351
Gateshead 37,957	.. 34'5	..	100
Cardiff 7,052	.. 4'3	..	6.3

The number of convictions for drunkenness per 10,000 of population in 1906 for England and Wales was 61·18.

Speaking at the Summer Assizes at York in July, 1905, Mr. Justice Grantham said :—

Unless the people who belong to the working classes live in decent homes, how can you be surprised that they give way to the passion for drink? It is the only recreation which they have practically from the wretched hovels only too many of them have to live in, and pass their time. Then the drink excites them—pleasurably excites them—and they don't know when to stop. They have no homes really worthy of the name to go to, when they leave the public house, so they generally stop till closing time, when they have had a great deal more than it is good for them.

In view of these appalling facts none surely will dispute the conclusion of a recent Departmental Committee that "Every step gained towards the solution of the Housing problem is something won for sobriety."*

In spite of all that has been done by Factory Legislation to improve working conditions, causes very prejudicial to health still remain in connection with most of our manufacturing trades. For no other occupation, perhaps, has legislation done so much as for the cotton workers. Yet of the effects of employment in this trade upon young boys and girls of fourteen who have probably been bred in unwholesome surroundings and fed on unnatural food, Mr. Wilson, H.M. Inspector of Factories, says :—†

The hours will be long, fifty-five per week, and the atmosphere he breathes very confined, perchance also

* *Report, Physical Degeneration*, p. 33.

† *Ibid.*, p. 76.

dusty. Employment of this character, especially if carried on in high temperatures, rarely fosters growth and development; the stunted child elongates slightly in time, but remains very thin, loses colour, the muscles remain small, especially those of the upper limbs, the legs are inclined to become bowed, more particularly if heavy weights have to be habitually carried, the arch of the foot flattens, and the teeth decay rapidly, The girls exhibit the same shortness of stature, the same miserable development, and they possess the same sallow cheeks and careous teeth. I have also observed that at an age when girls brought up under wholesome conditions usually possess a luxuriant growth of hair, these factory girls have a scanty crop which, when tied back, is simply a whisp, or 'rat's tail.'

Here again we are permitting conditions to prevail which enervate the body and predispose to drink and vice.

But if in such a trade as that just mentioned, physical degeneration is caused and a predisposition to drink created, what must be the effect of working in other occupations where the conditions are infinitely worse. There is a close connection between the degree of drinking and the exhausting nature of an occupation. The greater the strain and intensity of the work, the more, it is found, intemperance prevails. The United States Labour Commissioner has published some figures giving the percentage of wages spent on drink by the workers in different occupations in this country and in America. From this we find that the PERCENTAGE of wages thus spent for the four trades, cotton, woollen, iron,

and glass, is lowest in the woollen ; the cotton comes next, being a little higher ; the iron trade is 100 per cent. above the woollen ; and the glass trade is 40 per cent. above the high proportion attributed to the iron workers. Every person acquainted with the character of the respective occupations will recognise the approximation of the expenditure upon drink to the strain of the work.

From that impressive series of articles dealing with the conditions of labour in the "white slave" trades, we take the following terrible confession.* Dr. Bellew, the leading doctor in Widnes, says :—

It would not be wise to pass a chemical worker at the ordinary rate for Life Assurance. The work certainly shortens life. For one thing, the men cannot do their work unless they are half drunk. They drink and drink. I have one patient who drinks half a cask (18 gallons) of beer a week. They drink because they cannot eat. I know men who have brought their breakfasts, dinners, and teas, back home with them from their work because they could not touch them.

There remains no need to call further evidence to prove that the surroundings, the houses, the lives, and the labours of the people are fruitful causes of intemperance. Drink finds its victims in every grade of society, but it is among the lowly of the land that its ravages are most devastating. The poor have few interests and fewer pleasures. Their lives are dull, dreary, and monotonous. Their

* *White Slaves of England*, Sherrard.

poverty is in very truth their destruction. The drink question is inextricably intertwined with all the questions which aim at the elimination of the social waste of human health, of human life, of labour and of wealth.

CHAPTER VII.

OTHER CAUSES OF DRINKING.

IN the foregoing chapters we have been endeavouring to prove that poverty, in the sense in which we have defined the term is the most important cause of drinking. But in attaching so much importance to conditions of life and labour as bearing on the drink question we have no desire to minimise the influence of other contributory causes. When trying to find an explanation for the apparent contradiction between the generally accepted opinion that temperance sentiment has been growing while the Drink Bill has been increasing, we suggested that the reason was to be found in the changed character of the occupations of a considerable portion of the working population, whereby they are under less supervision and discipline, and more constantly open to the temptations of the public-house and the invitations of their acquaintances to cement the bond of good-fellowship.

Much drinking is for no other reason than that it is supposed to be sociable to spend

one's money in paying for drink for a friend who neither needs nor desires it. Drinking, as a social custom, and not because those who drink like the drink or are unable to resist it, is responsible for a vast amount of money spent upon it. Man is a social animal, and drinking alcohol with his fellows is one of the unfortunate ways in which the social spirit has found expression. This phase of the drink question is not only responsible for an enormous and altogether wasteful expenditure upon drink, but it is often the cause of bringing men and women to ruin by creating a desire for drink or rousing in them some hitherto dormant hereditary disposition.

A third, and very important, cause of drinking, and especially of excessive drinking and frequent tippling arises from the opportunity, or as we should prefer to put it, the encouragement to drink by the opportunities provided. There are those who will put themselves to any trouble or inconvenience to get drink, but it is undoubtedly true that the great body of moderate drinkers would never feel the loss of drink if it were removed from their path, and certainly would not put themselves to much inconvenience to get it. But the presence of the public-house everywhere is a perpetual invitation to thoughtlessly indulge in drink ; and the business of the publican is to encourage his customers to support his trade.

Broadly speaking then, an enquiry into the drink question reveals the fact that it is in its causes and its effects exceedingly complex ; but there are certain outstanding features which enable us to form conclusions as to the nature of the disease and the conditions and causes and influences which pre-dispose to drinking. These have been dealt with under the three divisions of (1) conditions as to life and labour, (2) social customs, (3) the encouragement offered by the existence of the trade.

The treatment of the question must be in accordance with this diagnosis. As the causes of drinking are many and varied, so the remedies applied must be numerous and diverse. That drinking which is due to the first-named cause is not likely to be easily abolished. To effect that result involves a revolution of our industrial and social system. It involves the destruction of that monopoly in the means of life which enables a few to amass riches at the expense and degradation and poverty of the many. It involves a changed ideal in our political life, and a new conception of the nature of wealth. It requires the political life of the nation to be enthused with a religious determination to use the powers of law-making and of government to ensure a full opportunity to every child to develop its physical and mental possibilities. And this involves the parental care of the State in protecting the child from

the disastrous influences which to-day damn millions of infants from the moment of their birth; and it involves, too, a belief and practice that the first use of wealth should be to ensure for each a sufficiency of all the things which go to make the abundant life. It involves an appreciation of the whole problem of social waste, waste of wealth producing power, waste through misapplied labour, waste through misdirection and unequal distribution of wealth, waste through lack of organisation, waste through keeping ignorant and inefficient the masses who have infinite possibilities for goodness and greatness. This part of the drink question will settle itself as the conditions of life and labour which give rise to drinking are changed; and the work to this end which is immediately practicable and desirable will be discussed at a later stage of this enquiry.

The second of the important factors in the drink question lies within the legitimate sphere of the work of the Temperance societies, the teacher, and the preacher, who should aim at disseminating a more general knowledge of the foolishness of senseless drinking, and at substituting more reasonable ideas of expressing the feeling of fellowship.

The third contributory cause of drinking is within the sphere of legislation and administration. By direct action in removing

opportunities and encouragements undoubtedly a large volume of drinking which is not due to deep-seated causes will be eliminated.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOCIAL REFORM AND TEMPERANCE.

IN dealing with the industrial and social conditions of the people as a cause of drinking we specially emphasised (1) low wages, (2) long hours, (3) casual work and unemployment, (4) insanitary housing, (5) ignorance of hygiene, (6) lack of education, (7) absence of interest in elevating things. We pointed out the close connection between the extent to which these conditions existed in any industry or district, and the degree of drunkenness which prevailed. If this connection has been established, then it becomes the duty of everyone who wants to lessen drunkenness to be active in the forefront of social reform work.

The average income of the working class family is not sufficient, however wisely it may be spent, to provide a sufficiency of good food, of good clothing, and of house accommodation, with other such absolute necessities as fire and furniture. Wages are too low to rear healthy children upon. Out of a single wage of a pound or twenty-five shillings a week, with a family to support, it is impos-

sible to pay a rent of eight or ten shillings a week, which is the least sum for which a house in a decent neighbourhood, with sufficient accommodation for a family, can be obtained in most of our large towns and cities. Low wages compel the family to live in an overcrowded condition in a neighbourhood which is insanitary because of its overcrowded state. The result of the combination—overcrowding and insufficient nourishment—is to starve the children, who grow up to swell the army of industrial inefficients and unemployables and the victims of the drink appetite.

The State has recognised the necessity and the wisdom of insisting upon a minimum of sanitation in factories and workshops. To preserve the health of the individuals, because of the loss of wealth-producing power through inefficiency and ill-health, we have had the innumerable statutes regulating hours and conditions of labour. Outside the workshop, and due to the same appreciation of the waste caused by neglecting to apply knowledge to prevent disease, we have the Public Health Acts, the Food Adulteration laws, the hospitals and dispensaries for the treatment of disease at the public expense. But not yet have we applied this principle where it is most needed, and where the benefits would be greatest. We insist upon the factory worker, in the interests of his health, having a certain amount

of air space. But we take no thought as to whether he is being paid a wage which will enable him to get enough food to sustain him, or a home in which he can rest and be restored. And yet this is a matter which comes in order of importance before those to which we have given some attention. A State, alive to the importance of saving waste, of getting the best and most out of its material, would lay down that the first charge upon all production was a wage which would in no case be below a sum adequate to maintain the worker and his dependents in a state of health and comfort. This would be found to be a policy of highly remunerative social economy. What is humanely right can never be economically unsound, and the economy of high wages, even from the employers' point of view, which is not always that of society, is now being increasingly recognised.

The demand for a shorter working day by law can be defended on many grounds, but by no means the least important of the arguments in its favour is that its adoption would result in a great improvement in the character of the workers. All experience supports this optimistic expectation. Each reduction in the hours of labour in the textile trades has been followed by a spontaneous rise in the standard of life of the operatives. The latest reduction of hours in this trade—the twelve o'clock Saturday stop—has been of enormous

benefit. In fine weather advantage is taken of cheap excursions, and the general use of the cycle on a Saturday afternoon is seen in the crowded state of the roads giving exit from the manufacturing towns in the north. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, speaking in the House of Commons on April 15th, 1905, referred to the fact that the great boom in the cotton trade has not, as former booms in the trade had, increased the consumption of drink. If the Chancellor had had a sufficient knowledge of facts, he would have been able to add that the operation of the twelve o'clock stop, the giving of more leisure to the workers which they had wisely employed, was one of the main reasons for the fact he stated.

There is a point at which a reduction in the working day might not have such satisfactory results. A cutting off of but a very little from the end of a long day of very hard work would probably lead to increased drinking, for the workmen would leave work in an exhausted state and incapable of the effort to take up any new pastime except sitting in a public house. The important thing to remember is that the hours of labour should not be so long as to completely tire the workman, and the leisure left between ceasing work and bedtime should be so long as to be worth the effort to turn to some interesting pastime or recreation. This is the secret of the great

success of the twelve o'clock Saturday stop. The operatives have had a short day, they leave work comparatively fresh, and by the time they are washed and dressed the whole afternoon is still before them.

Striking confirmation of this argument is furnished by Mr. John Rae,* who, in an article on the effects of the general adoption of the Eight Hours Day in Australia, says that largely as a result of the Eight Hours Day there is growing up in Australia a working class population which for intelligence and sobriety have no equals among the Anglo-Saxon race, and the like of which has never been seen in the world before. He mentions the very significant fact that the people who oppose the Shorter Day in Australia are the publicans, for they have discovered that when a man leaves work not completely exhausted, but with a little vitality left, he has no desire to spend his time sitting in a public house, but feels impelled to take some outdoor recreation or to engage in some intellectual study.

We might multiply similar testimony, but we will be content to give but two or three other exceedingly valuable testimonies to the usefulness of a reduction in the hours of labour in promoting temperance reform.†

* *Economic Journal*, May, 1901.

† Further evidence of the effect of the shorter hours on sobriety is given in Appendix III.

The following valuable testimony is taken from a report issued by the Society for promoting Industry and Trade in Russia, extracts from which appeared in the *Labour Gazette* for March, 1906. It relates to an experimental reduction of the working day from twelve to eight hours in a paper mill at Dobrush in the province of Moghilev. The Manager, Dr. Stulchinsky, writes as follows on the results of the working of this experiment for a year and a half :—

I have been managing Prince Paskievitch's mill for twenty years. The nature of the business requires that the work be carried on night and day. Up to May, 1894, the length of the shifts was 12 hours. Eighteen months ago I determined to try and reduce the hours of those working by the day to 9, and of those employed on shifts to 8. Instead of increased drinking by the workmen, the result has been that the only drink-shop in the place has had to give up business, its place being taken by a tea-shop, where only moderate quantities of spirits can be obtained. 'Saint Monday' is almost a thing of the past. The older people, as a rule, employ their leisure time in tilling their plot of land, which they formerly let on lease. The younger ones have taken to reading. An orchestral and vocal union has been established, of which 36 factory operatives are members. Between 400 and 500 operatives regularly attend lectures got up by the local priest. Such things were impossible under the whole 12 hours system ; for there is only one recreation for exhausted workers and that is spirit drinking, which quickly stimulates their energies.

The irregularity of work and the frequent periods of total unemployment have a demoralising effect upon the character of the

men affected. All who have been brought into touch with the unemployed have been painfully impressed by the rapid deterioration of moral strength and self-respect which a period of want of work develops in the formerly respectable workman. It is quite natural that a man who feels that society cares so little about him that it is content to let him starve, will soon get into a frame of mind in which he cares not what society thinks of him. He feels that he is a social out-cast, a useless cumberer of the earth. Human help and human sympathy are denied to him, and it is not to be wondered that he finds comfort and forgetfulness in drink.

Irregular employment is almost equally destructive and demoralising in its effects. In the intervals between intermittent work the casual is open to every temptation to drink. He is enfeebled in body by insufficiency of food, and when the luck of a few days' work comes round again he feels the need for a stimulant, which he ignorantly tries to find in drink.

Work for the unemployed; the better organisation of labour, so that workmen may settle into regular and steady habits, are temperance reforms of the first magnitude. Intimately bound up in this question of the better organisation of labour is that of systematic overtime, which is economically unsound, physically injurious, and morally debasing.

The facts given in a previous chapter bearing on the relation between housing and intemperance are a powerful appeal to the temperance reformer to lend the weight of his support to the municipal reformer, who is agitating to sweep away the disease-haunted, drink-sodden slum, and to provide habitations in which it is possible for human beings to be self-respecting, healthy, and sober.

From an unexpected quarter confirmation of the effect of better housing on sobriety was given at the meeting of the Bath Brewery Company by the Chairman (Colonel H. F. Clutterbuck), October 14th, 1904. Speaking of the decrease of drinking, he said :—

He thought himself that it was partly due perhaps to the fact that the nation was growing more sober . . . and also he thought it was **LARGELY** due to the better housing of the working class. A man now-a-days instead of going home to a dirty, untidy cottage, full of children in one room, found that his house was more comfortable.

It is indisputable that the ignorance of the working classes about health matters, food, and the rearing of children is responsible for much of the physical degeneracy which in its turn leads to drinking. One of the painful things about working class family life is that, small and inadequate as the income is however well laid out, the income is often so expended as not to give the best results. The respective values of different kinds of food is unknown to them, as, far too often, is a know-

ledge of how to prepare the food. Infant mortality, as is proved beyond doubt, is due as much to wrong feeding as to the lack of food. Instead of homely, health-giving foods forming the staple of the workers' fare, highly seasoned, "appetising," prepared foods are consumed, which ruin the digestion, provoke thirst, and drive to drink.

The class of house which is to-day being erected for respectable working class families is only possible because of the ignorance of the people who are to inhabit them as to the conditions of health. If the people were educated to know what is the minimum of air space necessary for health, we should not have the bye-laws of the Public Health Authority satisfied with but two-thirds of the air-space for the honest worker which is insisted upon for the criminal in our gaols.

A knowledge of the laws of health is the greatest educational need of our age. Some part of that time which is now given in our schools to teaching the ancient mythologies, and learning the tricks of figures and the meaning of words might be far more profitably devoted to teaching the boys and girls—the citizens of to-morrow—how to keep their bodies healthy and pure; and to preparing the girls for the great responsibility of motherhood, a responsibility which comes upon them to-day and finds them in most cases totally ignorant of how to discharge it.

There still survives much ignorant superstition about the virtue and value of alcohol. Temperance teaching from a temperance platform has two grave defects. It is given to the people who do not require conversion, and if it reaches the ear of the sinner it fails to strike conviction because of the prejudice against its source. The teaching of temperance, of the truth about alcohol, should be the work, not of a voluntary body, but of the State, which pays so heavily for the prevailing ignorance upon the question.

The request for such teaching as a part of the school curriculum was put before the Board of Education in 1904 in a petition signed by 14,718 medical men. After calling attention to what has been achieved in this direction by English-speaking nations, in regard to the teaching of the nature and effects of alcohol in the Army schools and in some of the principal colonies, the petitioners state that a widespread ignorance prevails concerning, not only the nature and properties of alcohol, but also its effects on the body and the mind. They, therefore, urged the central education authorities to include in the simple hygienic teaching desired, elementary instruction at an early age on the nature and effects of alcohol. They also urged the necessity of ensuring that the training of all teachers shall include adequate instruction in these subjects.

Such regular and systematic teaching would

do much to save the next generation from drink. Not much, it is to be feared, but something might be done on the same lines for the present generation of adults by the Public Health departments regarding alcoholism as a danger as great as typhoid, and taking equally drastic steps to arrest its ravages. The sporadic posting of a few placards pointing out the dangers of alcohol is not enough. The placards posted by more than a hundred cities and boroughs in 1905 were excellent, but the effect was lost when the first shower of rain washed them from the hoardings.* The warning needs to be as constantly before the eyes as the temptation to take the drink.

Not merely is knowledge of the laws of health involved in the temperance question, but the whole subject of education too. The man without education is on the level of the brute; his appetites and tastes will be those of the brute. The ignorant, uneducated man has such a limited number of interests that drink can easily claim him for its own. The spread of education, with its widening of outlook and increase of interests, will do great things for Temperance Reform. Education must accompany increased power and enlarged opportunities, or better not the power, better not the opportunity. In the extension of real education—the drawing out

*Newcastle-on-Tyne, with a population of 264,000, posted 100 placards on the posting stations.

of the best—we shall be substituting for the low taste, which now finds gratification in the pothouse and the sensuous pleasures of the cup, a love of “things which are more excellent.”

The social instinct is eternally implanted in the human breast. It will find some means of expression. For lack of something better, the public-house has become the centre of social intercourse. An increase in the number of things in which a man is interested will reduce both the amount of time he can spend in the public-house, and his inclination to do it. The provision of other centres of social intercourse of a less objectionable character would also withdraw men from the publichouse. The institution of the “two turns a night” music-hall with cheap charges, it is said, has affected the public-houses most disastrously from the brewers’ point of view. The entertainment of a cheap music-hall may not be the most ideal and intellectual of pastimes, but it is infinitely preferable to the public-house; and the person who begins his musical education with the popular song may by and by attain to an appreciation of the classical ballad

The keener interest in politics taken by the working classes, which is shown in the remarkable progress of the Labour and Socialist movement, will have a beneficial effect upon Temperance. The Socialist movement is not

only absorbing the spare time of a great many working men, but its propaganda is providing a counter attraction to the public-house. It is within the knowledge of the writer that thousands of men in the aggregate attend the Sunday evening Socialist meetings who formerly spent those evenings in the public-house. The interest in social questions which is aroused thereby has a transforming influence on the man ; he has found a new and inspiring purpose for his spare activities, and this gives him an ideal of the seriousness of life which is inconsistent with the waste of his time in drinking.

In the same way the great working class organisations—the trade unions, the co-operative societies, the friendly societies—have done much, by increasing the interests and activities of working men, to counteract the influence of the public-house. It is unnecessary to further pursue this argument. Its soundness is obvious, its truth is proved by universal experience.

Two witnesses to support the contentions urged in this chapter may be called. In January, 1903, Mr. Justice Lawrence had a maiden Assize at Huntingdon, and in remarking upon this he said that he looked to good air, pure water, effective drainage, sanitary houses, and reasonable amusements to improve the drinking habits of the people more than repressive legislation. A witness giving evidence

before the Committee on Small Holdings in 1906 said :

The relieving officer has on more than one occasion informed me that there is not now a single able-bodied man receiving out-door relief, and the Superintendent of Police, some years ago, in his report for Quarter Sessions, stated that, in his opinion, the decrease in drunkenness was attributable to the spread of allotments and small holdings around Catshill.

Social Reform is the most effective Temperance Reform. To make our country sober, we must make its people free. The reforms outlined in this chapter are only palliatives, but they are palliatives which will so improve the physical and mental state of the workers that the social revolution will be much more speedily realised.

CHAPTER IX.

DRINK AND ECONOMIC POVERTY.

IF one ventures to state that drink is not the chief cause of poverty, one is sure to be charged from certain quarters with a desire to minimise the evils of intemperance, with being an aider and abettor of brewers, and a friend of publicans and sinners. To many well-meaning people, the whole social problem resolves itself into one word—Drink. The economic teaching of the Socialists has compelled the teetotallers of the type mentioned to moderate their statements when closely pressed ; but the frequency with which one still meets the dogma in temperance literature and speeches shows that the belief is still widely held and propagated.

In the Alliance Almanac for 1908, Sir George White writes :—" If the working classes of this country spent (in drink) only at the same rate as the same classes in America and Germany, £50,000,000 would be saved from the drink traffic, and be transferred to useful branches of industry, finding full employment for at least two millions extra people, and thus give occupation to all capable of working."

One of the most moderate of Temperance writers* states the case in words which fairly express the opinion of the general body of the Temperance party. He says, "The common sale and consumption of alcoholic drink—apart from all other evils of intemperance—IS BY FAR THE MOST POTENT FACTOR IN THE PRODUCTION OF POVERTY."

Even such a well-informed social student as Sir T. P. Whittaker has committed himself to a statement very similar. He says :†

How is it we have all this poverty, misery, disease, and death? Drink and Drinking is responsible for a very large proportion of it. It is the chief cause. Directly or indirectly it is responsible for the greater part of the poverty, crime, incompetence, sickness, and early death, which afflict the great mass of our poorer classes.

It is with real regret that one is compelled to expose the error and absurdity of the claim that drink is the chief cause of poverty. One would earnestly wish that the industrial and social evils that exist could be traced to such a simple cause. The work of the social reformer would be indeed simplified if by the suppression of drinking the problem of poverty could be solved.

In preceding chapters we have dealt at length with the causes of drinking, proving that poverty in the wide sense of the term is one of the most fruitful causes. But we have never attempted to deny that drinking

* J. Stewart Gavin, *Alliance News*, March 26th, 1897.

† *Economics of Drink*, p. 52.

was a cause of poverty in individual cases, nor that it did not in a great many others aggravate poverty. Socialists have no desire to minimise the economic evils of drinking; what they do protest against is the false assumption that the poverty of the workers is caused by their drinking habits, and that if it were not for their expenditure upon drink their economic poverty would not exist.

The testimony of Mr. John Burns on this point is so telling, and is expressed in such forceful and picturesque language, that we must reproduce it. He says:—*

They lie in their teeth when they say that the unemployed are drunken and improvident. Here stand I, a skilled artisan, a teetotaller, a vegetarian, a Malthusian, a non-smoker. I have been out of work for four months. I haven't tasted food for twenty-four hours. There stands my wife. She has turned the ribbons of her bonnet over and over again to make them look respectable. If this be my condition, what must it be for men who are not mechanics and have families to maintain.

The conclusions of Mr. Charles Booth and Mr. Rowntree have been so often quoted that they are generally known, but it may be useful to repeat them for the sake of reference.

The figures Mr. Charles Booth gives relate to some 4,000 cases, 1,600 belonging to the "very poor" and 2,400 to "the poor." Of the "very poor"

* *Daily Chronicle*, November 22nd, 1885.

4 per cent. were loafers.
 14 per cent. were due to drink and thriftlessness.
 27 per cent. were due to large families, illness, etc.
 55 per cent. to questions of employment.

Of the "poor"

13 per cent. due to drink and thriftlessness.
 19 per cent. due to large families, illness, etc.
 68 per cent. to "unemployment."

In explanation of these figures Mr. Booth says: "To those who look upon drink as the source of all evil, the position it here holds as accounting for only 14 per cent. of the poverty in the East End, may seem altogether insufficient; but I may remind them that it is only as principal cause that it is here considered; as a contributory cause it would, no doubt, be connected with a much larger proportion."

Mr. Seeböhm Rowntree gives us the following results of his investigations into the causes of poverty in York.

(1) LIVING IN "PRIMARY" POVERTY.

Definition: Earnings insufficient to obtain minimum necessities for physical efficiency.

Cause.	Number.
Death of chief bread-winner	1,130
Illness or old age	370
Out-of-work	167
Chronic irregularity of work	205
Largeness of family	1,602
Lowness of wage	3,756
	<hr/>
	7,230

In addition to these 7,230 living in "primary" poverty, as defined above, Mr. Rowntree found 13,072 persons living in "secondary" poverty. Secondary poverty is defined

as that of families whose total earnings would be sufficient for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency were no part of them absorbed by other expenditure, either useful or wasteful. As to "secondary" poverty in York, Mr. Rowntree gives the following as "immediate causes":

Drink, betting, and gambling, ignorant or careless housekeeping, and other improvident expenditure, the latter often induced by irregularity of income.

And, as to the first causes, he says:

Though we speak of the above causes as those mainly accounting for most of the "secondary" poverty, it must not be forgotten that they are themselves often the outcome of the adverse conditions under which too many of the working classes live. Housed for the most part in sordid streets, frequently under overcrowded and unhealthy conditions, compelled very often to earn their bread by monotonous and laborious work, and unable, partly through limited education, and partly through overtime, and other causes of physical exhaustion, to enjoy intellectual recreation, what wonder that many of these people fall a ready prey to the publican and the bookmaker?

Professor A. G. Warner has collected the reports of trained investigators in England, Germany, and America, and he makes the following summary of their conclusions:

Probably nothing in the tables of the causes of poverty, as ascertained by cold counting, will more surprise the average reader than the fact that intemperance is held to be the chief cause in only one-fifteenth to one-fifth of the cases; and that where an attempt is made to learn in how many cases it

had a contributory influence its presence cannot be traced at all in more than 28·1 per cent. of the cases.

If Mr. Charles Booth seeks to imply that 14 per cent. of his investigated cases are in poverty entirely through intemperance then we join issue with him. But he does not maintain, so far as we can gather, that even in the cases where he assigns Drink as the cause of the poverty, that abstinence would raise the family above the poverty line. Mr. Rowntree, at any rate, makes no such bold assertion in regard to York. The rule in these investigations seems to have been to put down Drink as a cause wherever it was found that some portion of the family income was spent upon it. If a considerable portion of the income of a poor family is spent in drink it certainly aggravates their poverty; but this foolish expenditure of a too small income is not the CAUSE of the poverty. The family would still be poor if they were teetotallers.

But even if it were granted that 14 per cent. of the poverty of the poor is due to drinking, and that if these people were temperate they would be raised out of poverty—a contention which we by no means admit—it is evident that the statement that total abstinence would carry with it the virtual abolition of poverty is a wild exaggeration.

In the report of the Royal Commission on the Aged Poor issued in 1895, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Ritchie, Dr. Hunter, Mr. Charles

Booth, and Sir H. Maxwell made the following statement :

We also agree that the imputation that old age pauperism is mainly due to drink, idleness, improvidence, and the like causes, applies to but a very small proportion of the working-class population.

When teetotallers talk about drink being the cause of poverty it is charitable to suppose that by poverty they mean a condition below that of ordinary respectable working class life. But if this be so, if their idea of the abolition of poverty is the raising of those who are below up to the standard of the thrifty artisans, with, say, a family income, economically spent, of thirty shillings a week, then their ideas of poverty and those of the Socialists are widely different. But to attain even to that state of working-class affluence would require an improvement enormously vaster than the Temperance people imagine. Taking Sir George White's statement, quoted above, where he says that the transfer of £50,000,000 a year from the drink bill to other channels of employment would find work for two millions extra workpeople, it appears that, assuming every penny of this went in wages, these extra people would receive less than 10s. a week per head. The payment of a wage of less than 10s. a week for useful work is the Temperance party's ideal solution of the problems of poverty and unemployment.

The Temperance party estimate that the average annual expenditure on intoxicants by those of the working classes who drink is £17 14s. 2d. per family. Sir T. P. Whittaker, commenting on this waste, says, "What a difference would £17 14s. 2d. per family make if properly and prudently spent." Quite true; but seven shillings a week per family does not make the difference between poverty and a desirable standard of life.

Those who maintain that drink is the main cause of poverty know little of the extent of poverty. Mr. Booth states that 30·7 per cent. of the whole population of London are on or below the poverty line of incomes not exceeding one guinea a week per family. Mr. Rowntree found that the average wage for the labourer in York is from 18s. to 21s. a week, whereas the minimum expenditure necessary to maintain, in a state of physical efficiency, a family of two adults and three children, is 21s. 8d. "The wages," he says, "paid for unskilled labour in York are insufficient to provide food, shelter and clothing adequate to maintain a family of moderate size in a state of bare physical efficiency, no allowance being made for any expenditure other than that absolutely required for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency."

Speaking at Perth on June 5th, 1903, Sir

H. Campbell-Bannerman said :—

In this country we know—thanks to the patient and scientific investigations of Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Charles Booth, both in different fields and by different methods, but arriving at the same results, which has never been questioned—we know that there is about 30 per cent. of our population under-fed, on the verge of hunger, doubtful day by day of the sufficiency of their food. Thirty per cent. ! What is the population of the United Kingdom ? Forty-one millions. Thirty per cent. of 41 millions comes to something over 12 millions.

Beyond this class of “underfed” millions “always on the verge of hunger” are the vast masses of the slightly better paid workers whose lives are unceasing struggles to keep above the poverty line.

The common sight of a man losing his employment through drink, and the equally familiar instance of a teetotaller “getting on,” seems to lend support to the idea that drink is a cause of unemployment and poverty. But a little consideration shows how rash is such a conclusion. Drink is a selecting agent. The teetotaller, if otherwise equally well qualified, will be preferred to the man who drinks. But when a teetotaller takes the job of a drinker, there has not been any additional employment created. One man was out before. Drink has now selected a different man to take his place.

CHAPTER X.

THE ECONOMICS OF TEMPERANCE.

SOCIALISTS maintain that the poverty of the wage-earners is caused by their economic subjection to landlordism and capitalism. The landlord owns land. The people must have access to the land. So the landowner is able to exact a rent for the use of his land; and the amount of this rent is determined by the competition for the use of particular sites and the means of the persons who require the land. Every increase of population, therefore, increases the competition for land; every increase in the wealth of the community enables the landlord to exact more rent. "Every permanent improvement of the soil, every railway and road, every bettering of the general condition of society, every facility given for production, every stimulus supplied to consumption, raises rent."*

The power of the capitalist is analogous. The conditions of modern industry require that the workers must have access to large units of capital if they are to be profitably

* Thorold Rogers, *Political Economy*, Ch. xii.

employed. Their wages depend upon employment provided for them by the owners of capital. The capitalist employs his capital to make profit. His profit depends upon getting labour for less wages than the value of the wealth which labour produces. To enable him to induce the workers to take less in wages than the value they create, it is necessary to have a surplus of labour competing for employment. "The modern system of industry will not work without some unemployed margin," as Mr. Charles Booth puts it. These unemployed compete for work; the employer wants labour at the lowest price; hence the tendency is for the rate of wages to fall to the lowest point which the workers, under necessity, will accept. These are the two chief factors in fixing wages—the degree of competition, and the cost of living for the social status of the workman.

Just as the landlord takes unearned increment, so the capitalist appropriates what he cannot help sharing with the landowner of the increase of wealth accruing from the increased productivity of labour. The wages of labour do not depend upon the percentage of profit. A strong trade union may sometimes gain an advance of wages in very profitable times when labour is scarce; but never is the increase more than a very small proportion of the increased profit.

Temperance cannot of itself weaken the power of the landlord and the capitalist. The teetotal workman is just as much under the subjection of their monopoly as is the workman who drinks. It is "the subjection of labour to monopoly which is the cause of the evils and inequalities which fill the industrial world," and so long as this subjection exists, the landless and capitalless workers, whatever their virtues, must remain economically poor.

This statement of the cause of poverty is not urged as a justification of the expenditure upon drink. But it is important to know the truth, and Temperance has sufficient to commend it to the workers without the support of unfounded claims.

The money spent upon drink is largely economic waste. Only in so far as the expenditure upon drink takes the place of other refreshments which are necessary or sustaining, can the expenditure be justified. In so far as the drinking inflicts injury, it is worse than an economic waste. But apart from that, treating the question purely as a matter of social economy, the great bulk of the money spent on drink is waste. The labour employed in the trade does not add to the national wealth; it is supported by the labour of the productive workers and gives nothing useful in return.

But in this respect the drink traffic is in the same position as all the occupations

and trades which exist to gratify the idle and luxurious tastes of the rich. Economically there is no difference between the drink traffic and the maintenance of flunkies or the keeping of racers. Each finds work ; but the persons thus employed are paid for out of wealth extracted from the useful workers, who have to maintain these non-productive, useless servants. If the workers who are employed in such occupations as the drink trade were paid their present wages to do nothing, nobody would be a penny the worse. Why the expenditure upon luxuries and personal services by the rich is foolishly regarded as being of social advantage, is because if the rich did not so expend their surplus wealth, the persons they now employ would be among the unemployed. In the case of the rich, their expenditure upon luxuries comes after all their necessities and reasonable comforts have been satisfied, and, therefore, if it were not spent, it would not be used to further encourage the staple industries. But in the case of the working classes it is different. Their expenditure upon drink, in so far as it is unnecessary, is a diversion of income from necessities to absolute waste.

Though it is true that the money spent upon drink, and all the capital and labour employed in the trade, is in a real sense social waste, it by no means follows that if

it were abolished the masses of the people would gain economically by the change. If the traffic were abolished, the rich would probably spend what now goes in drink in some other form of vice or luxury, employing people in that direction quite as uselessly as they are now occupied. But as to how universal abstinence would effect the wage-earning classes opinions differ and controversy rages.

We do not think it is a very profitable pastime to conjecture what would happen if drink could be all at once removed. There is no more possibility of such a thing happening than of an invasion from Mars. It may be good economic theory to maintain that universal abstinence would lower wages, but economic theories, no more than other sorts of theories, are universal in their operation.

It is argued that as wages are regulated by competition, and under competition the tendency is for wages to fall to the point of subsistence, if the cost of living were reduced by the withdrawal of some item of hitherto recognised expenditure, wages would fall by that amount. This assumes that the drink expenditure at present does form an item in the recognised minimum standard of living. It is doubtful if this is so. This assumes that those who spend a fairly considerable sum in drink are the great majority of the working men. We

do not think that is the case. The argument assumes further that the standard of living of the teetotaller is lower than that of the drinker, which is the very reverse of the fact. The number of working men who spend little or nothing on drink has been increasing. Granting that formerly the drink allowance did enter into wages, meanwhile the non-drinkers have been applying that part of their wages to raising their standard of living, to procuring better food, better clothes, better homes. This has had the result of raising the whole standard of working-class life, and this is the established "minimum on which the population will choose to subsist."

But the sudden abolition of the liquor traffic would bring such absolute chaos into the labour and commercial markets that the state of things would be similar to that produced by a great industrial revolution, and the workers might be unable to resist a considerable depression of their standard of life. If the labour displaced by Prohibition could be immediately absorbed in other occupations, which the Prohibitionists seem to assume would be the case, then no reduction of wages would follow. But it would be impossible to do that. If those workers who now spend considerably upon drink sought to transfer that expenditure to useful things, these trades could not meet the sudden demand upon them. Prices

would rise to impossible figures. The labour suddenly displaced from the liquor trade could not be employed in making clothing, boots, and furniture, or even in building houses. It would be unskilled labour, and would be competing for employment in a market already overcrowded. On the other hand there is to set against the increased demand for useful things of the former drinkers, the withdrawal of the purchasing power for these things of the then unemployed liquor trade employees. So the reasonable probability is that the sudden and complete Prohibition of the liquor traffic would not increase the demand for goods of a useful character, but would add a million useless persons to the unemployed ; and the awful competition of the labour market caused thereby would depress wages beyond imagination.

These results would follow the enforcement of universal Prohibition, though no such consequences are to be feared from the gradual spread of the practice of Temperance. This is reform on the right lines, and must tend to the raising of the standard of working-class life. It is the sober, intelligent workmen who fight for better conditions. It is they who are the best supporters of the staple industries of the country. It is they who give their children a better start in life. It is they who are self-respecting and self-confident. When a drinker

becomes an abstainer he does not lower his expenditure, but he increases it. The drinker is satisfied with a miserable existence; the sober workman is always striving to raise his conditions of life.

The powers of even a sober working-class to better their conditions are very limited under the subjection of landlord and capitalist monopoly. Their conditions can only be improved in so far as they combine and successfully lessen the power of the monopolists. Temperance in itself cannot improve the economic state of the workers, but it is a very useful condition for applying effective means which will do so. Indeed, if the workers are simply content to be temperate, and to allow landlordism and capitalism to use their powers unchecked, then the virtue of abstinence will curse the abstainer economically and bless the monopolists.

The result is seen in the way in which the working-class demand for better housing benefits the landlord. Though universal Prohibition might not be followed by lower wages, it is pretty certain that there would be a general rise of rents. The experience of every-day life suggests this; though actual confirmation is furnished by the Temperance Party themselves. In a pamphlet published by the Alliance* the following innocent confession is made:—

There are many places in England where no public

* *The Curse and the Cure*, p. 16.

houses exist at all. What is the condition of these places? A section of the township of Toxteth in Liverpool, containing about 60,000 people, in 200 streets, with 12,000 houses, is one of these. How does it get on without drink shops? Have all the respectable people rushed out of the district? Nothing of the sort. People are so anxious to get into the neighbourhood that there is hardly a house to be got. The dwelling-houses there realise rents of about one third more than those obtained for houses of equal style and accommodation in liquor shop neighbourhoods.

Assuming that the workers retained their present wages, the saving of what is now spent in drink would be equivalent to an increase available for some other purpose. The following extract seems to suggest that the landlord would put in a successful claim for this amount:—

Replying to a demand for higher wages for the labourers in Deptford Victualling Yard, Mr. Goschen (House of Commons, April 14th, 1899) said "that if it were consistent with proper administrative principles to make an advance of the wages of these labourers, he would certainly do so. But there was a larger question than that of the amount involved, which was infinitesimal. If the position of the labourers at Woolwich and Deptford was as described, it was rather due to sweating landlords than to the rate of wages. The wages had been raised 20 per cent. in the last ten years, and the house rents 50 per cent. It was constantly the case in those districts that the increase of wages only led to a larger sum going into the pockets of the landlords, and he was even told that some of the men who were locally the loudest in the cry for justice to the labourers were owners of cottage property, who would benefit if the wages were raised.

Of course there are ways and means of preventing the landlords from appropriating these rewards of virtue. But to apply them would be to apply Socialist principles, and those who claim that temperance would solve the poverty problem must confine themselves to proof that temperance itself would do this.

TEMPERANCE AND EMPLOYMENT.

The further claim made that, if the money now spent in drink were devoted to other and more useful objects there would be a great increase in the volume of employment, is without foundation. The statement of Sir George White, M.P., already quoted, is typical of the form in which this claim is made. A reduction of £50,000,000 a year in the drink bill would, he claims, find employment for two million more workers. Let us test this by a simple fact. According to the figures of Dr. Dawson Burns the drink expenditure ACCORDING TO POPULATION was £33,844,554 less in 1906 than in the year 1900. According to Sir George White this ought to have found employment for 1,300,000 more workers. But was this the case? The Board of Trade Returns show that there was more unemployment when the drink bill was lower than when it was higher. And there is this further very important fact, a fact which goes down to the very root of the question, that though there

had been an increase of unemployment, there had been a vast increase in the volume of wealth produced. To put these facts clearly we will present them in the form of a table :

Year.	Drink Bill.	Percentage of Unemployed.	Total Foreign Trade.	Total of Income, assessed to Income Tax.
	£ millions.		£ millions.	£ millions.
1900 ..	185	2'9	877	833
1906 ..	166	4'1	1068	925

Here are some facts for those to explain who maintain that the transfer of expenditure from drink to other articles will solve the unemployed problem and abolish poverty. Contemporary with a great reduction in the expenditure upon drink, unemployment has increased, wages have declined, wealth has grown, and the profits of the rich have risen. The explanation is that there are economic forces at work determining the conditions of labour and the distribution of wealth, which the Prohibitionists ignore. It may be true that to produce goods of the same selling value, more labour is employed in manufacturing clothing, furniture, and in mining, agriculture, etc., but in all these trades the number of persons employed in proportion to the output is every year getting smaller. Here are a few facts :—

THE COTTON TRADE.

Year.	Raw cotton used, Lbs.	Number of Persons employed.
1881 ..	1,471,357,776	586,470
1895 ..	1,553,758,080	538,883
1904 ..	1,701,215,488	523,030

In twenty-three years there has been an INCREASE of about 15 per cent. in the volume of the raw cotton worked in this country, and a DECREASE of about 11 per cent. in the number of persons employed. If this tendency goes on, and it certainly must with the advance of improvements, it must follow that an increase of demand for such goods will not provide additional employment. The same tendency is to be seen operating in every one of our staple industries. It is not true, therefore, that total abstinence can provide work for all; the causes of unemployment are clearly economic. There is this further point worth mentioning, that total abstinence would improve the efficiency of the workers, and, therefore, a smaller number would be able to turn out the same volume of production.

The contention that the transfer of purchasing power would find much more employment deserves consideration from another point of view. The contention is put forward by Sir George White in the article already mentioned. He says:—

The drink trade has a gigantic capital, makes very large profits, and has an extremely small wages fund; therefore, money spent in it is, from the workers' standpoint, absolutely wasted. The year's turnover of a large brewer is twenty times the amount of his yearly wages account; whilst the ordinary manufacturer will pay to his wage-earners a year's turnover in three and a half to four years. A Scotch Whiskey firm, making an average profit of £120,000 yearly, pays £600 a week (£31,200 a year) in wages, but ten times the amount, viz., £6,000 weekly would be paid in wages

to make such a profit in most of the manufacturing industries of the country.

The fallacies in this statement are two: first, that the wages paid in the distillery represent the employment given in making the whiskey produced in this distillery; second, that the profits do not provide employment. The distillery process is only one operation in the work required to get whiskey from the barley stage to the bar counter. The drink traffic employs the greatest portion of its labour in other functions than the actual production of the drink in the distillery or brewery. The census returns give only some 56,000 persons as being employed as maltsters, brewers, and distillers, but the number of persons employed in the liquor traffic (with their dependents) is put down variously at from 1,225,000 to 1,966,000. In the *Daily News*, August 30th, 1904, Mr. G. B. Wilson went into this question minutely with the object of disproving the statements made by the trade as to the extent to which it gives employment. As a matter of interest we will summarise his conclusions and compare them with the trade figures:—

	Trade Figures.	Mr. Wilson's
Makers ..	213,000 ..	97,540
Distributors ..	775,000 ..	325,912
Dependents ..	900,000 ..	653,331
Agriculturalists ..	78,000 ..	150,000
<hr/>		<hr/>
Persons employed ..	1,966,000	1,226,783

The liquor traffic is not the only trade which makes a big profit in proportion to

its wages bill. Take the railways of this country. This is not a productive business. It gives nothing in return for its receipts but service. Yet we find in 1906 the following:—

Total Receipts	£ 117,227,931
Working Expenses (including Wages) ..	72,781,854

Profits	44,446,077
-----------------	------------

The item of wages is not given separately, but it can be ascertained by analysis that it does not amount to a sum equal to that distributed in profits. A more remarkable instance of enormous profits made by a small wages fund is that of the Coats' Sewing Cotton Syndicate. The profits of the firm amount to £3,000,000 a year and the wages bill does not exceed £500,000. It would be easy to multiply illustrations by the hundred to show that in many of the industries making the necessities of life the proportion of wages to profits is very small.

But in the extract given above it is assumed that the profits of the drink trade employ no labour. The profits are spent in employing labour to produce food, clothing, houses, luxuries for the people who live in idleness out of the drink traffic. It comes back in wages, one way or another; but, and this is the social waste of it all, it employs the workers to keep others doing nothing, who pay the wages out of profits they have taken from other workers' labour.

The argument then that the drink traffic

employs a much smaller number of persons in proportion to the turn-over is losing its force every year. It was practically abandoned by Mr. James Whyte, the Secretary of the Alliance, in an article in the *Commonwealth* for August, 1896. "I believe," he said, "that the liquor trade gives much more employment than Dr. Burns and Mr. Hoyle were disposed to allow. In this I by no means stand alone among temperance men."

The economic argument against expenditure upon drink is that such expenditure is unnecessary; it does not support life or give efficiency. The profits of the trade enable a class to live on the labour of the workers, without rendering any social service in return—just as do the profits of landlords and capitalists. Economically, the drink traffic is analogous to other expenditure on luxuries, but as it is indulged in to such a great extent by the working-classes, who can only afford luxuries by sacrificing necessities, it is especially harmful. The spending of any part of a workman's income on drink aggravates his poverty, though it is not the cause of his poverty. Abstinence on the part of the workers would not of itself improve their economic condition, for it would not touch the power of the landlord and capitalist to appropriate surplus value; though abstinence is desirable from every point of view, even as a necessary condition for effective warfare against monopoly.

CHAPTER XI.

STATE PROHIBITION.

FOR more than four hundred years legislators have been trying to make men sober by Act of Parliament. It is true that for a considerable part of that time there has been the counteracting influence of a material interest felt by one of the departments of the state in the prosperity of the drink traffic. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has depended upon the intemperance of the nation to enable him to make both ends meet.

All the restrictive and regulative legislation has failed to lessen the volume of the drink traffic. It must not be assumed that this legislation has been useless. It would baffle the most imaginative mind to conceive what the state of things would have been if the liquor traffic had been free to carry on its trade without licensing and restriction. But, notwithstanding this restraining influence for good, it must be admitted that legislation has so far failed to effect sobriety. The question therefore now arises: Is it impossible for legislation to prevent drunkenness; or are there some, as yet, untried legislative powers which would achieve that desirable end?

In 1853 the United Kingdom Alliance was formed. "The history and results of all past legislation in regard to the liquor traffic abundantly prove," says its Declaration of Principles, "that it is impossible satisfactorily to limit or regulate a system so essentially mischievous in its tendencies"; therefore, "all good citizens should combine to procure an enactment prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages, as affording most efficient aid in removing the appalling evil of intemperance."

On the 10th March, 1864, the late Sir Wilfrid Lawson moved for leave to bring in a Permissive Prohibitory Intoxicating Liquors Bill, the object of which was to give the ratepayers of localities permission to prohibit the common sale of intoxicating liquors in their own districts. The motion for leave to bring in the Bill was opposed, but was carried by 72 votes against 38. Five years later the Bill reached Second Reading, when it was defeated by 195 to 89. On seven subsequent occasions (the last being in 1878) the Bill was rejected by overwhelming majorities. The election of 1880 very much altered the constitution of the House of Commons, and on the 18th of June of that year a Resolution in favour of Local Option was carried by 231 votes to 205.

Since that time Local Option has taken its place as a recognised proposal of temperance

reform. In 1895, Sir William Harcourt on behalf of the Liberal Government of that time introduced the Intoxicating Liquors Local Control Bill. It granted to the people of localities power to veto, by a two-thirds majority, the sale of intoxicating liquors, except in regard to railway refreshment rooms, hotels, and eating houses. Two other options were permitted—(1) to reduce, by a simple majority, the number of licenses by one-fourth ; (2) by a simple majority to prevent the sale of drink on Sundays. This Bill never reached a Second Reading. The Government were defeated on the War Office Vote, and a General Election followed, with disastrous consequences to the Liberal Party. The unpopularity of the Local Option Bill was very commonly assigned as one of the chief reasons for the defeat of the Liberals at the polls. If this were true, it has an important bearing upon the wisdom of devoting great efforts to securing the enactment of such a law ; for its success in practice must depend upon the degree of public opinion in favour of restricting the number of licenses.

It is impossible to estimate the measure of influence exerted by particular questions at a General Election when so many issues are before the country. It is more likely that the widespread disappointment with the Liberal Government's record of social and labour legislation had more to do with their

defeat than the Local Option Bill.

The Right Hon. Herbert Gladstone, Chief Liberal Whip, speaking at Manchester, Nov. 24th, 1897, said :—

The heaviest burden the Liberal Party had to bear at the last General Election, with perhaps the exception of Home Rule, was that of direct veto. He said that after consultation with scores of his colleagues in the House of Commons.

The new Parliament elected in January, 1906, was soon given an opportunity of expressing its views on Local Option. On April 10th, 1906, the following Resolution was moved by Mr. Leif Jones :—

That this House notes with satisfaction the successful working of the local option laws in the colonies, and approves the principle on which these laws are based, namely, that the people ought to possess, through a vote of the local electors, the power to protect themselves against the admitted evils of the Liquor Traffic.

This resolution was carried by 273 votes to 46, most of the members of the Government voting in favour.

The position attained by Local Option in the temperance reform programme demands that the question should receive consideration in these pages. It is scarcely worth while to discuss Prohibition by the State, or the power of veto over a large area, because, while the extreme temperance party still hold to "Prohibition by the State" as an ideal, they have never put such a proposal into the form of a Parliamentary demand, resolution, or bill.

The United States of America has been for nearly a century a fruitful field of experiments in the control of the liquor traffic. Since 1851, when the State of Maine adopted Prohibition, it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that every State in the Union has been kept in a condition of ferment on the liquor question. The advantage has alternated between the two parties. A strong pull and a long pull has at intervals given the temperance party a temporary victory, but the effort has generally left them too exhausted to keep the advantage they had won. The Prohibition sentiment was too weak to act unconsciously, and after a short, but usually disastrous experience, the prohibitory law has been repealed. During the past three years the States have enacted 164 separate laws directly affecting the liquor traffic.*

At one time or another 17 States have had stringent Prohibition laws. Fourteen of these have abandoned Prohibition as impracticable. In 1907 a great wave of temperance agitation passed over the United States. It was a convulsion analogous to the religious revivals which sometimes come—and go. Under the influence of this wave of sentiment two small States, Oklahoma and Alabama, enacted Prohibition in 1907, while in a third State, Georgia, Prohibition came as a result of the Atlanta

* *Foreign Office Paper*, Cd. 3284, p. 105.

riots, the white populations deciding to close the saloons for self-protection against the drunken negro mobs.

The Rev. W. J. Dawson, in an article recently published,[†] says "Six GREAT States—viz., Maine, Kansas, North Dakota, Georgia, Alabama, and Oklahoma have enacted Prohibition laws. IN NOT ONE OF THESE STATES IS IT POSSIBLE TO SELL OR PROCURE ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR." This extract is quoted as a typical specimen of the reckless and unfounded statements made by fanatical and emotional would-be temperance reformers. Such statements contribute nothing useful to the discussion of a great and difficult problem, but serve only to condemn as absolutely untrustworthy the advocates of this particular proposal.

Not one of the States mentioned is a GREAT State. Georgia is the most highly populated, and 83 per cent. of its people live in villages of less than one thousand inhabitants. In this "great" State at the census of 1890 the average number of persons per square mile was 31, while the average density in this country is over 500. Oklahoma is a practically uninhabited prairie, having only just recently been raised to the dignity of a State. North Dakota is very similar, the density of the population being four persons per square mile. Kansas, Maine and Alabama are all thinly populated States. The fourteen States which

[†] *Christian World*, Jan. 2nd, 1908.

have tried and abandoned Prohibition were mainly the populous States of the Union. The two States which have most recently repealed their Prohibition laws are Vermont and New Hampshire, and these were the most populous of the then existing Prohibition States, though their density was not one-twelfth that of this country. Vermont had been under Prohibition since 1852, when the majority for Prohibition was 13,000 votes. It is significant of much that two generations born and reared under Prohibition should in 1902 repeal the statute and give power to the towns to adopt a license system. The case of New Hampshire is very similar. The State is mainly agricultural, and only the votes of the isolated farmers had succeeded in preventing the repeal of the Prohibition law long years ago. In 1903 there voted for licenses 34,330; against licenses 26,630. A majority of the village units voted for "no license"; at one place (Waterville) only one elector turned up, and he unanimously carried the cause of Prohibition.

The statement is made in the quotation from Dr. Dawson's article that "in not one of these (Prohibition) States is it possible to sell or procure liquor." Opinions differ widely as to the actual measures of success attending Prohibition, but the bold assertion that "in not one of these States is it possible to sell or procure liquor," will find little support even among the strongest Prohibitionists.

There are not two more extreme Prohibitionists in this country than Mr. Joseph Malins and Mr. Guy Hayler, a North of England temperance agent. Both these men have personally investigated the working of Prohibition in America, and both are witnesses strongly biassed in its favour. Mr. Malins says, "In some places the Prohibition law is grossly violated."* Mr. Guy Hayler,† describing the state of things in Portland, Maine, quotes from one issue of the leading daily paper of that town several instances of raids upon liquor sellers, "just as in the days of Sheriff Pearson and his predecessors."

An official verdict as to the success of Prohibition is given in the Foreign Office Report recently issued, and from which quotations have already been given. Referring to Kansas, this Report quotes from the Message of Governor Hoch to the State Legislature, 1905 :

In three or four of the large cities of Kansas, Prohibition has never been thoroughly enforced, and during recent years this number has been increased till it now probably amounts to some 25.

In these towns a system of monthly fines usually prevails, which amounts practically to a license system. Sometimes the dealer is formally arrested, pleads guilty, and is fined anything from 50 to 100 dollars, according to the amount usual in the place. Sometimes the police officer, without actually taking

* *A Journey Round the Globe*, page 7.

† *Northern Echo*, April 20th, 1904.

the offender to the police station, releases him on receiving a cash bond for his appearance. The dealer fails to appear when the case is called, and the bond is forfeited. In either case the dealer may look forward to being left unmolested in his business till the succeeding month.

In the larger cities the saloon has become a recognised and permanent institution. In the smaller, virtual local option prevails; Prohibition is the law, but its enforcement is in the hands of local elected officials.

Mr. Vice-Consul Keating, of Maine, reporting on the enforcement of Prohibition in Portland, states that for two or three years previous to 1905 the Sheriff had organised a system of restricted saloons where the sale of liquor was well known to the public and the officials. The Sheriff himself, a total abstainer, had recognised his inability to suppress the liquor traffic, and had adopted this method as the lesser of two evils. In 1905, one of the periodic outbursts of prohibitory enthusiasm came, and the saloons and bars were closed. The Vice-Consul reports that the result has been to throw the liquor traffic into the hands of pocket pedlars.

Prohibition, while it certainly restricts the sale of liquor, certainly does not suppress it. While the poor, improvident, or stranger, is compelled to seek the pocket pedlar, the average non-abstainer can get rather more than he wants at the numerous clubs or else at his or his friend's home; and if his wants are running low, a telephone order to a dealer in the neighbouring State will soon replenish his stock by the next train or express.

This extract sums up fairly well what is the generally accepted conclusion among impartial persons as to the results of State Prohibition in America. Where there is a sparse and widely scattered population it is possible to enforce a prohibitory law over the whole State. But a considerable part of the population in the villages and towns is always in revolt against the Prohibition. No law can be enforced against a strong public sentiment. The violation of such a law, like passive resistance and anti-vaccination in this country, is not regarded as criminal. The effect, however, of open violation is very serious upon the public respect for law, and it brings the Government and administration into general contempt. Experiments in State Prohibition, under far more favourable conditions than obtain in Britain, offer no encouragement to this country to attempt a policy of State repression enforced by police law.

CHAPTER XII.

LOCAL OPTION.

THE case of Local Option differs from State Prohibition. Most of the American States which have repealed their State prohibitory law have adopted systems of Local Option. Local Option is very generally the law in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Before proceeding to consider the results of Local Option in other lands it might be well to discuss the abstract arguments for and against the principle itself.

It is accepted as a settled principle that the community has a right to interfere with a private trade, when the way in which it is carried on is injurious to the persons employed in it, or to the public. It is undeniable that the drink traffic increases poverty, crime, and lunacy. The community has to pay the cost of dealing with the effects of drunkenness. The contention that the drinkers contribute to the revenue a sum equal to the cost of maintaining the poor and administering justice does not affect the point. The taxation upon liquor is not imposed to meet the expenses of dealing with the damage it does, any more than the tax upon tea is to pay for curing the indigestion it may cause.

The licensing powers of the magistrates admit the right of the community to regulate, to restrict, and even to prohibit the sale of liquor. The magistrates act as the representatives of the people, and in theory are supposed to express the will of the people in licensing matters. To transfer the magistrates' power directly to the votes of the people is the assertion of no new claim by the community; it is simply a change in the method of exercising a right; it is a change from representative to democratic local government.

Local Option claims the advantage of being adaptable to local conditions, and of providing a means of reducing the number of public houses with the growth of temperance sentiment in a district. The people of the locality are better judges of their own needs and wishes than a bench of magistrates exercising a wide jurisdiction. Local Option can only prohibit the traffic within the district in which a large majority of the electors have expressed their desire to that effect, and therefore it will be enforced with the authority of a strong public opinion,—the best guarantee of success.

Opponents of Local Option urge that to give the power to a majority to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor is a tyrannical interference with individual liberty. The answer to that is that such an objection might have some weight as an argument

against total State Prohibition, but it cannot tell against Local Option. Local Option is not the prohibition of the use of liquor. Its utmost power does not extend beyond prohibiting the sale in public houses within specified areas. Local Option would not "rob a poor man of his beer." The most it could do would be to put him to a little more trouble to get it. Local Option is simply giving the power to the people to say whether a public house should be licensed in a certain place, or what number of such places shall exist, or whether new licenses shall be granted. The removal of the temptation of the open door of the public house is of greater importance than some little increase of inconvenience to the man who is determined to get drunk. The nuisance of a public house in a district where the great majority don't want it, is surely a greater interference with individual comfort than to put a small minority to some little inconvenience by removing it.

The abstract justice of conferring the power of Local Option upon the people is unanswerable. The case against Local Option is rather a practical than an abstract one. If Local Option be put forward as a complete legislative scheme of temperance reform, then much can be said against building one's hopes upon its success. The most urgent reform in connection with the drink traffic is to lessen the amount of drinking in the poor and densely populated parts of our towns. Local Option has little hope

to offer of doing this. As it would require a two-thirds majority of the electors to veto the traffic, it seems to follow that it would be only where a strong temperance sentiment existed that the public houses would be closed. Local Veto is a proposal for vetoing the traffic where little or no traffic exists. It could not apply where most needed, and Local Vetoists have no proposals for dealing with the traffic where the people refuse to veto it.

It is maintained in some quarters that the drink-sodden people in the slums would use the power of veto to remove the thing that curses them. Such optimism is admirable, but it is very unsubstantial. The plebiscites which have been taken at times by the Temperance party, and which have shown such great majorities for Local Option are valueless. There is all the difference, as every member of Parliament well knows, between voting for an abstract resolution and a concrete proposal. Local Veto in the abstract is fascinating, but when it becomes a question of voting to close the business of a friend or lifelong acquaintance the matter assumes a very different appearance. It may be fascinating to indulge in prophecy as to how far Local Option would be applied in this country, but the conclusions would be only matters of opinion. We are, however, justified in judging of probabilities by the experience of Local Option in other lands.

In investigating the results of Prohibition

and Local Option abroad one striking fact everywhere manifests itself. Whatever measure of success has been attained by a suppressive policy has been in thinly populated country districts. Such a policy has invariably broken down when it has been applied to large centres of population. The late Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, Mr. James Whyte, states,*—and to emphasise the fact he prints the words in italics,

Up to date there is no large town—I think I may say in the world—in which the liquor traffic has been dealt with satisfactorily by any method whatever.

The drink question in our country resolves itself into grappling with the traffic as a town problem. Therefore, if evidence can be produced that Local Option has been successful over wide areas, and among a large population in the aggregate, that would be no evidence that a similar result would follow in this densely populated country. Even if it were possible to show that Local Option is in successful operation in large towns in other countries, that would not be conclusive proof that such a policy would be successful here. Other circumstances have to be considered. The strength of the temperance sentiment, the religious character of the people, racial peculiarities, climatic and industrial conditions, might in other countries aid its success—influences and conditions which may be absent here.

* " *The Alliance Vindicated*," p. 52.

No temperance reform will be of service in this country which is not effective in towns. The temperance agitation arose with the growth of the modern towns. The concentration of the population brought new problems; problems of public health arose which necessitated new forms of town government. There is a greater difficulty of dealing with an evil among a congested population; in the country districts there is greater fear of law. The main cause of drinking operates far more vigorously in towns than in the rural districts.

LOCAL OPTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

It has been pointed out that four-fifths of the American States which at one time tried Prohibition have abandoned it. It failed because of the difficulty of enforcing it in the towns. And these "towns and cities" are mostly small country villages. Yet it was found impossible to keep these small centres of population "dry." So the wise policy was followed of leaving the matter to the decision of the localities. The result is that almost universally the country districts vote for Prohibition; but where two or three are gathered together the public house must be in the midst of them. The results of Local Option in America are sympathetically, but critically, summed up in the following extract*:

* *Foreign Office Report*, Cd. 3284-1, April 1907, p. 107.

If the aim of liquor legislation is to bring about a diminution of drinking, it may be said that Local Option, of all the systems in force, effects real Prohibition over the largest possible area with the least possible friction. It is almost invariably found that the towns vote for license, and the country districts Prohibition. . . . It may be pointed out in this connection that the three States which retain Prohibition are almost entirely agricultural communities. As for the causes of the distinction, it is probable that temperance feeling is stronger in the rural districts; but it must not be forgotten that almost everywhere in the United States the population is sparse compared with the United Kingdom, distances are greater, and country police anything but omnipresent.

The Temperance Party claim that 30,000,000 of the population of the United States are living under the operation of Prohibition. If this be so, and if Local Option is at all effective in reducing drinking in the areas of its operation, then the license districts must be terribly drunken, for the Drink Bill of the country in 1904 was £255,545,400. The expenditure upon drink is increasing annually, as the following figures show:—

UNITED STATES EXPENDITURE ON DRINK.

Year.		Dollars.
1899	..	973,589,080
1900	..	1,059,563,787
1901	..	1,094,644,155
1902	..	1,172,565,235
1903	..	1,242,943,118
1904	..	1,277,727,190

Clearly, Local Option in the United States has not dealt with the problem of the drink traffic in the towns.

LOCAL OPTION IN CANADA.

The experience of Canada points to the same conclusions. There is no other part of the world where temperance sentiment is so strong and widespread. The consumption of liquor per head is but one-fifth of the consumption in the United Kingdom. The colony has a Dominion Local Option Law—known as the Scott Act—as well as Provincial Local Option laws. The Scott Act, which was hailed as the precursor of national salvation, was at one time in force in a number of towns and country areas. In most of these it has been abandoned owing to the opposition of the towns. The operation of Local Option is widespread under provincial law, but the difficulty experienced in the United States of securing the vote of the towns has been met with here also. It might be noted that the majority required for “no license” in the Provincial Acts is usually three-fifths; but the Temperance party, finding an increased difficulty in getting this majority, are now agitating for an alteration of the Provincial Local Option laws so that a majority of one may carry Local Veto.

Though plebiscites and votes have shown large majorities in favour of Prohibition, and though Local Prohibition by the vote of the province is widespread, neither the Temperance sentiment nor the operation of Local Veto appears to have done anything to lessen drunkenness in the Dominion. In recent years there has been a startling increase in

drunkenness and crime in Canada. In 1903 the total convictions for all offences in Canada was 50,404, whereas the average for the five preceding years was 40,851. The convictions for drunkenness for 1903 totalled 16,532, the average for the years 1898-1902 being 12,123. These increases might be accounted for by the increase in population, but another set of facts prove conclusively that the consumption of drink per head is on the increase. The following figures tell the tale :—

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF WINE, BEER,
AND SPIRITS IN CANADA.

Year.	Imperial gallons per head of Population.					
	Wine.		Beer.		Spirits.	
1895 ..	0'09	..	3'4	..	0'69	
1905 ..	0'10	..	5'4	..	0'94	

In the same period in the United Kingdom, without Local Option, the reduction in the consumption of liquor has been as follows :—

CONSUMPTION PER HEAD IN UNITED KINGDOM.

Year.	Wine.		Beer.		Spirits.	
1895 ..	0'37	..	29'6	..	1'00	
1905 ..	0'27	..	27'7	..	0'91	

We do not argue from these startling figures that Local Veto increases the consumption of liquor, and that the absence of the power tends to sobriety ; but the figures do prove conclusively that there are factors in the drink question which restrictive legislation cannot touch in the least.

The strenuous effort of the Canadian Temperance Party, under national conditions very favourable to the success of legislative

restriction of the traffic, have failed to make an impression upon the consumption of drink. Clearly the experience of Canada gives little encouragement to hope that in our country the power of Local Option would be exercised in such a way as to lessen the amount of drinking and drunkenness.

LOCAL OPTION IN NEW ZEALAND.

The Temperance Party in this country point to New Zealand for confirmation of their claim that Local Option is a practical way of dealing with the liquor question. But the conditions are so different as between the two countries that comparisons are of little value. The area of New Zealand is 110,000 square miles,—more than that of Great Britain; the population of the whole country is less than Glasgow and district. The country is mainly pastoral, there are no great towns, industrial and social legislation is very advanced. The conditions are healthy; the population is selected; everything is favourable to sobriety. The Temperance Movement, which is prohibitory in its aims, is extremely active and its agencies are innumerable.

In the year 1894 a Local Option law was enacted. It requires a three-fifths majority of the voters who poll to carry "no license" in any electoral district. Polls are taken every three years, and the results have been as follows:—

Year.		For Continuance.		For Reduction.		For no License
1896	..	139,580	..	94,555	..	98,312
1899	..	143,962	..	109,449	..	120,542
1902	..	148,449	..	132,240	..	132,240
1905	..	182,884	..	151,057	..	198,768

In 1905, in 36 out of 68 licensing districts a majority of the votes polled was for no-license, but not in sufficient number to make up the three-fifths required to carry the issue. In three districts where no-license was carried in 1902 the position was kept, and in three other districts the necessary majority for no-license was secured. In the four cities—Auckland, Dunedin, Christchurch and Wellington—about one-third of the votes were given for no-license. It will be seen that the percentage of voters supporting reduction and “no-license” has shown a continuous advance. At the first election only one district—Clutha—gave a majority for “no-license,” and this district remained in splendid isolation until 1902, when five other districts secured the necessary three-fifths majority. In two of these cases the vote was afterwards declared to be invalid.

Ten years of Local Option in New Zealand has apparently done nothing whatever to lessen the amount of drink consumption. In six districts only has the law been put into operation to the extent of Local Prohibition, and meanwhile, nationally, the consumption of drink has increased, and the number of convictions for drunkenness has

increased also. The following figures taken from official publications are instructive:—

CONVICTIONS FOR DRUNKENNESS IN NEW ZEALAND.*

Year.		Per 1,000 population (excluding Maories)
1899	..	8.26
1900	..	9.50
1901	..	10.32
1902	..	10.34
1903	..	10.70
1904	..	11.32
1905	..	10.03

The convictions for drunkenness among the native-born population (who constitute 51.85 of the total over 15 years of age) are only 17 per cent. of the whole number.

Since the passing of the Local Option Law the consumption of alcoholic liquors has greatly increased.

CONSUMPTION OF BEER AND SPIRITS IN
NEW ZEALAND.

1.—BEER.

Year.		Total Gals.		Per head of Pop.
1894	..	5,019,973	..	7.4 gals.
1900	..	6,966,908	..	9.1 „
1905	..	8,014,430	..	9.2 „

2.—SPIRITS .

Year.		Total Gals.		Per head.
1894	..	439,153	..	0.65 gals.
1900	..	549,932	..	0.52 „
1905	..	634,827	..	0.73 „

It is only fair to add that since 1901 the consumption of drink per head has shown no tendency to increase. On the contrary, however, there has been a striking increase in crime since 1897, the number of distinct

* *New Zealand Year Book.*

persons committed to prisons having risen from 25·84 per 1,000 of population to 34·27 in 1904.

The Drink Bill of New Zealand for 1903 was £3,056,590, being £3 10s. 7d. per head of the population, and for 1904, £3,152,849 and £3 10s. 10d. respectively.

In the face of all these facts we fail to find much encouragement to hope that Local Option will do much to lessen the volume of the drink trade in the United Kingdom. In reviewing the operation of Local Option in New Zealand it should be remembered that there is the women's vote to take into consideration. At the poll of 1905 the women voters formed 44 per cent. of the total, and it is believed that the increasing vote for "no-license" is accounted for by the growing interest of the women in public affairs. Compared with the polling in the year 1902, the total number of votes shows a numerical increase of 41,380, or 22·95 per cent. on the part of the men, and 36,178, or 26·11 per cent. on the part of the women, clearly showing that the latter are now taking greater interest in Local Option matters than they formerly did.

The experience of Canada and of New Zealand is repeated in our Australian Colonies. All the States have Local Option laws, some enacted so long ago as 1885, but they have not been put into operation to any extent. The right to veto the issue of new licenses has been very extensively exercised,

but in extremely few cases has "no license" been carried; and there seems to be a fairly unanimous opinion that in these few instances the experiment has been a failure. Sir George Turner, an ex-Premier of Victoria, informed an interviewer* that "in Mildura, a portion of the colony of Victoria, which has Prohibition, he believes that more drink is consumed than in any other place in that colony. In his opinion there is no surer way of making the people take to liquor than to close all the hotels and make the traffic illegal."

The Bishop of Ballarat, speaking at the Royal Colonial Institute in 1897, said:—

I think a mistake was made in attempting to make Mildura "prohibitionist." This may suit some places, but I can say from personal knowledge that at Mildura the result has been disastrous. It lowered the moral tone of the community, for it generated on a large scale bogus clubs and sly grog shops, which under the circumstances, people came to use without a sense of degradation.

The number of police cases connected with drink I found painfully large in the settlement.

Although practically nothing has been done in Australia to prohibit the sale of drink, there has been in all the States a tendency to a diminished consumption of liquor. Under each of the heads of wine, beer, and spirits, the consumption per head of population in 1905 was lower than in 1891.

It may be remembered that we laid it down that proof of the success of a form of legis-

* *Bradford Observer*, June 12th, 1896.

lative control in one country did not justify the conclusion that the same policy would achieve success elsewhere. Our review of the operation and results of Prohibition and Local Option in the United States, Canada, New Zealand and Australia has not shown a measure of success which would justify us in hoping that much would come from Local Option in the United Kingdom, even if the conditions here were as favourable as in the other countries mentioned. But the conditions in Great Britain are far less favourable than in any of the countries where Local Option is the law, and therefore the difficulties in the way of its success here will be greater.

It is maintained, however, that the United Kingdom can furnish many instances of the successful operation of Local Veto. On August 27th, 1907, a Government return was issued giving the number of civil parishes in Rural Districts in England and Wales with no "on" licenses. The totals are as follows :—

LOCAL VETO AT HOME.

ENGLAND AND WALES.

Number of Civil Parishes in Rural Districts. (1st April, 1904)	Total Popula- tion of Rural Districts (1901)	Number of Civil Parishes in Rural Districts with no "On" Licenses.	Total Populat'n of Civil Parishes with no "On" Licenses.
Total 12,995	7,469,488	3,903	575,129

In 3,903 civil parishes in rural England and Wales there are no public houses. But how is this an argument for local Veto? Why are there no public houses in these parishes?

Simply because the parishes are too thinly populated to support public houses, and because in practically every case there are adjoining parishes which provide all the facilities for getting drink which the inhabitants of the "no" license areas desire.

The Temperance Party make much of the Prohibition areas of Toxteth, Bessbrook, and the estates of Mr. Cameron Corbett, M.P., near London. In these cases Prohibition is enforced by the will of the landowner, and such a district naturally attracts people who are teetotallers or temperate. None of these Prohibition residential districts present any features which distinguish them from any other new district with the same class of property, in which Prohibition is not enforced. Mr. Wm. Crossfield, J.P., in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Liquor Licensing Laws, referring to the "no license" areas in Liverpool, said, "I am bound to say that with very little trouble from the centre of that area an unlimited quantity of refreshments could be obtained," and in reply to a question as to whether the people living in the restricted area were in any way abstainers more than in licensed districts, he answered, "Oh, no ; I am sorry to say not."

The United Kingdom Alliance claim* that the case of Bessbrook, a linen manufacturing town of 4,000 inhabitants, is a striking example of the blessings of Local Prohibi-

* *The Alliance Budget*, p. 22.

tion. We will confine our comment to the reproduction of the following letter from the Rector of Bessbrook, dated January 6th, 1908 :—

I can give you any information you may require about Bessbrook. I have been rector for the past seven and a half years, but before coming here I knew all about it as my native place is just fourteen miles from it. The founders of Bessbrook determined to exclude from it the three P's ; the pawn-office, public-house, and police barracks. The former two are still absent, but the police barracks is here for the last ten years. There are public-houses near it ; one at Millvale, ten minutes walk ; multitudes in Newry, forty-five minutes walk. The Workhouse is beside Newry. I am one of the Chaplains. Bessbrook is, and has been ever since I knew it, the reverse of " a teetotal Paradise." Drunkenness is very common, and convictions at Newry Petty Sessions are frequent. There is a fair amount of crime. You may take it for granted that the gaols at Armagh and Dundalk always have some Bessbrook people in them. In saying this, I do not wish to represent it as being worse than any other manufacturing town of the same size, but it is clearly no better. There is much poverty through the idleness of many who could work but will not, and disease is prevalent. I was in England at the time of the General Election, and was amused at the notion that I had come from the most exemplary place in the British Islands."

If the Prohibition areas in Britain were vastly superior in comfort and general well-being to the licensed areas, this state would be a strong testimony to the value of abstinence, but that fact would have no bearing whatever on the question as to whether the democratic power of Local Option would be generally exercised. An interesting incident

bearing on this point is furnished by the case of Port Sunlight—the model village of Messrs. Lever Bros. In October, 1900, an inn was opened in the village on strictly Temperance lines. It was so conducted for nearly two years, when a request was made that alcoholic drinks should be sold. The matter was put to a vote of the adult population of the village, when, on a large poll, 80 per cent. of the votes cast were in favour of alcohol being introduced. If a people living under such conditions as the inhabitants of Port Sunlight do, desire to have the convenience of a liquor shop, it seems as if there would be little chance of carrying Local Prohibition in less fortunately circumstanced localities.

Short of the total suppression of licenses in a locality is the option of reducing the number. Nothing in connection with licensing statistics is more unsatisfactory than the relation between the number of licenses and the convictions for drunkenness. From these statistics it is an easy matter to show that a reduction in the number of licenses, to use the words of Mr. Gladstone, "if it pretends to the honour of a remedy is little better than an imposture." We will give one comparison, taking two towns in every respect fairly comparable, namely, the two Lancashire boroughs of Accrington and Nelson. The towns are but twelve miles apart, fairly equal in size, both cotton weaving centres. The figures as to number of licenses, convictions

for drunkenness, etc., are as follows* :—

	Population	On Licenses	Off Licenses	Clubs	Convictions for Drunk'nss
Accrington ..	43,122	93	31	10	144
Nelson	34,816	15	17	16	202

Accrington—One conviction per 300 of population.

„ One license to 347 of population.

Nelson—One conviction per 162 of population.

„ One license to 1,025 of population.

Such contrasts as these might be given by the hundred. There are many reasons which might be suggested to account for the paradox. The stringency of police supervision varies in different districts. The number of unlicensed drinking places in the case of Nelson, cited above, is more than the number of public houses. In Accrington the number of clubs is less than one-ninth the number of licensed premises. These facts no doubt have a bearing on the drunkenness of each place. The suppression of a license will not destroy the drink appetite. It will, as we have shown, decrease the consumption of drink by only that amount which is consumed indifferently because the public house offers the opportunity. But, even this proportion of drink is not stopped by the suppression of a license here and there when ample facilities still remain. But those who will have drink—and these are the very people who require strict regulation—will find other means, if their former facilities are removed. The truth of this, and therefore

* *Licensing Statistics*, 1906.

the hopelessness of saving the heavy drinker by the suppression of licenses, was very forcefully stated by Mr. Asquith when introducing the Licensing Bill on February 27th, 1908. He said:—

For the past few months not a week has passed that I have not had brought to my notice cases in which a suppression of a license under the Act of 1902 has been followed almost immediately by the upgrowth of a club, not in the same premises, but very often next door, carrying on precisely the same business, often tied to the same brewer, who finances the whole affair—(cheers)—frequented by the same class of persons, the only difference being that no license duty was paid and that there are no restrictions as to the hours of opening and closing. Such places are often occupied during the whole of Sunday, sometimes in betting and gambling, as well as drinking, and there is no effective police supervision. That is a monstrous evil. It is a bad thing in the interest of the community, and it is a thoroughly unfair thing in the interests of the trade. I can quite understand the indignation—it seems a perfectly legitimate indignation—which is felt by those interested in the trade when they find that they have contributed to a compensation fund for the suppression of public-houses, and yet the moment one is suppressed a club springs up which carries on exactly the same business.—(Cheers.)

“The mere limitation of numbers—the idol of Parliament—if it pretends to the honour of a remedy is little better than imposture.” Our survey of the world-wide experience of this policy shows how true are those expressive words.

CHAPTER XIII.

“ DISINTERESTED ” MANAGEMENT.

THE most sanguine supporter of Local Option will admit that if the operation of such a law realises all his expectations a great volume of drinking will still remain for treatment. Though comparatively little success has followed past efforts at legislative or public regulation of the traffic, it is not outside the bounds of reasonable hope that some system of control could be devised which would reduce the abuses of drinking to a minimum. Local Option, as we have admitted, may be of partial benefit, but some method of control is required for the traffic in the districts where Local Prohibition cannot be enforced. The great weakness of the position of the Temperance Party is that it has no plan for dealing with the traffic except by Local Prohibition. Where there is most need for something to be done to lessen drunkenness, the Temperance Party's one proposal cannot be applied. The figures given in preceding chapters prove in regard to the United States, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, that though additional areas are coming

under Local Prohibition, there is a more than corresponding increase of drinking in the non-Prohibition districts. To deal with this is the great problem of temperance reform, in so far as public regulation or control of the traffic can lessen indulgence.

It is admitted that the opportunity to some extent makes the drinker; and when to the opportunity is added encouragement, we get a considerable amount of drinking, which might be abolished if the opportunity and the encouragement were lessened. In order to deal with this particular phase of the question many schemes have been tried and proposed, some of which have failed, some have achieved a certain measure of success, but none has so far established itself as a completely satisfactory method.

But the lessons of both the failures and of the moderate successes are valuable. In such a great question as this, experience must be the teacher, and we can only expect to evolve a practical and satisfactory system after many failures.

THE SCANDINAVIAN SYSTEMS.

In recent years public attention has been prominently directed to what is called the Scandinavian system. Under this system the sale of spirits is in the hands of a company endowed with a monopoly for a particular town by the licensing authority, which is the magistracy acting on the advice of the Town Council and Chief of Police.

Generally speaking, in Norway and Sweden, this company system in towns, controls the sale of spirits, and in the country districts Prohibition prevails. Though the principle underlying the Swedish (or Gothenburg) system and the Norwegian system is the same, namely, the elimination of private profit, there are important differences of detail in the two systems.

We desire neither to praise not to condemn the Scandinavian system. It was a pioneer on a very difficult road, and it would be surprising if all had been perfectly easy and successful. There is a voluminous literature dealing with the Scandinavian system, but unfortunately nearly all of it is written in a strongly partisan spirit. But the critic who brings to the consideration of the subject a desire to discover, not a complete solution of the liquor control question, but some results which may help towards progress in that direction, will find much to help him.

In the first half of the last century Norway and Sweden were the most drunken countries in Europe. Practically every family had its spirit still. In 1855 a very important Licensing Act was passed for Sweden. The domestic still became illegal, and the power was given to the commune to decide "not only in what manner, and within what limits, the trade should be carried on,

but also whether it might take place at all within its jurisdiction." The parish meeting was to be the deciding authority as to the issue of licenses. This power has been largely exercised, and Local Prohibition of the sale of spirits is the general practice throughout rural Sweden. Eighty per cent. of the population live outside the towns. The density of population is very small, the average number of persons to the square mile being only thirty for the whole country.

For years after the extensive adoption of Local Prohibition in the country districts, the towns remained in their former condition of drunkenness. In 1865 the system of disposing of license by auction was superseded in Gothenburg by what is now known as the Gothenburg system. The system, briefly described, is that all licenses for the sale of spirits in a town are handed over as a monopoly to a company formed for the purpose of working them. The company is to have no financial interest beyond receiving the ordinary rate of interest (which in Sweden is 6 per cent. and in Norway 5 per cent.), and the profits are to be devoted to purposes of public utility. The fundamental idea is the elimination of the incentive of private profit. A considerable freedom is allowed to the companies to frame regulations, but these bye-laws must be approved by the Municipal Council. The licenses are granted for short periods, five years in Norway,

and three in Sweden, except in the smaller towns, when one year completes the term. The governor can at any time, on emergency, order the closing of the public houses. At the end of the term of license the popular vote may refuse renewal. It should be borne in mind that the Company system applies to the sale of spirits only. There is practically free trade in beer and wine, a person being able to obtain a license for a very small sum.

There is a distinction between the methods of distributing the profits in the two countries. In Norway, no part of the profits may go to the relief of the rates. In Sweden, as a rule, the municipality receives seven-tenths, the general government two-tenths, and one-tenth goes to the local agricultural society. The idea of giving some portion of the profits to the general government and to agriculture is to benefit the country districts which, being themselves under Prohibition, have to obtain their liquor from the towns.

The Company system—known as the *Samlag*—became the law in Norway in 1871. It was not until 1894 that the principle of local control was enacted. The Act of 1894 gives to the towns (*a*) the option of a prohibition of the retail trade in spirits, (*b*) *Samlag* management. The reversion to private license is not allowed. When it is remembered that this Act was passed after twenty-three

years of experience of the Samlag system, it may be assumed that with all its short-comings, that system was considered to be very superior to private license. When the Act was passed in 1894 there was a Samlag in practically every town in Norway. By the operation of Local Option votes, 33 of these towns are now under spirit prohibition, and 26 under the Samlag. Seven towns which at one time were under Prohibition have by the popular vote re-introduced the Samlag.

The Norwegian system provides for the distribution of profits in the following manner :

1. To the State, 65 per cent.
2. To the Municipality, in lieu of higher license duties now abolished, 15 per cent.
3. To objects of public utility, not chargeable to the rates, but operating as counter attractions to the public-house ; to towns, 10 per cent. ; and to the surrounding country districts 10 per cent. ¶

Since the establishment of the Samlags, about £1,400,000 have been expended under heading (3) viz. : on " objects of public benefit." For nine years past the proportion accruing to the State has been set apart till 1910 to form the nucleus of an Old Age Pension Fund. The fund now amounts to over £500,000.

Having very briefly outlined the features of the Scandinavian systems, we will now proceed to enquire how far the systems have succeeded in promoting temperance. It is not claimed that all the undoubted in-

crease of temperance in Scandinavia is due to the company system. There has been carried on during the past fifty years a very active temperance propaganda which has educated the people to use their licensing powers. But this alone cannot account for the reduction in the consumption of liquor which has changed Scandinavia from being the most drunken to one of the most sober countries in Europe.

The following table gives the consumption of beer and spirits per head of the population in Sweden and Norway for certain years :

SWEDEN.				
Years		Beer Litres		Spirits Litres
1875	..	—	..	12'9
1879	..	—	..	12'5
1881	..	—	..	10'1
1885	..	—	..	8'4
1891	..	30'9	..	5'8
1895	..	35'5	..	6'1
1898	..	50'0	..	7'1
1902	..	56'6	..	6'9
1904	..	52'8	..	6'1

NORWAY.				
1875	..	23'2	..	6'5
1880	..	21'0	..	3'9
1890	..	18'8	..	3'1
1898	..	21'6	..	2'6
1902	..	17'8	..	2'9
1905	..	13'7	..	2'3

The reduction in the consumption of spirits has been greater in Norway and Sweden since 1874, than in any other country. The following table may be of interest :—

CONSUMPTION OF PROOF SPIRIT PER HEAD OF
POPULATION.

	Imperial Gallons.	
	Years	
	1875	1903
Sweden	3'06	1'65
Norway	1'47	0'7
Belgium	1'85	1'19
Holland	2'05	1'72
Germany	1'23	1'76
Austria	0'82	2'64
France	0'93	1'56
United Kingdom	1'36	0'99
United States ..	1'30	1'22

The year 1875 marks the real beginning of the work of the Samlags in Norway. The striking decline in the consumption of spirits in Norway and Sweden, when compared with the corresponding figures of other countries, points to the operation of some influence in the former countries which has not been operating in the latter. The only reasonable suggestion that can be offered is that the system must be mainly responsible. It might be added further that this reduction in the consumption of spirits in Scandinavia has been concurrent with considerable commercial prosperity.

Figures as to arrests for drunkenness in Scandinavia are frequently cited as proof that more drunkenness prevails under the company system than in Great Britain. Such statistics are of no value. For instance, the arrests for drunkenness in Portland, Maine, "where not one drop of liquor can be obtained" in 1898 were 42 per thousand of the

population, or seven times higher than in Cardiff. Or to give a Norwegian comparison, Bergen, which is a Samlag town, shows average arrests for drunkenness per 1000 population 25·5; whereas Stavenger, which has Spirit Prohibition, shows 34·4 of similar arrests. Bergen, under the company system, has little more than half the drunkenness, judged by arrests, of Portland under total Prohibition. In considering the question of arrests for drunkenness in Scandinavia many things have to be taken into account, but two points should be specially remembered, namely, that there is no company control of the sale of beer, and that towns are the drinking centres for the wide Prohibition districts all around.

Far more valuable than police statistics on a matter of this sort is the opinion of disinterested men who have a knowledge of the facts from personal experience. No Englishman who has investigated the working of the Scandinavian systems has condemned them except Prohibitionists and men connected with the liquor traffic. A Scotch Commission visited Norway in 1906 at the request of the Scottish Temperance Legislation Board and in its Report it states :—

A deep impression was caused in our minds by the emphatic declarations made by Norwegians of all classes in favour of the Samlag system. The unhesitating approval of the system by Statesmen,

Clergymen, Physicians, Town Councillors, Police, Press, Employers, Labour Leaders, and Workingmen, was very remarkable. But more significant than this was the agreement among "Totallists" and Prohibitionists that the Samlag was a powerful aid to sobriety, inasmuch as it helped to restrain excessive drinking, and thereby raised the moral standing of every town in which it was at work. It is hardly possible to represent by the mere written word, the earnestness and sincerity with which grey-headed veterans in the campaign against drunkenness testified to the power of the Samlag as a reforming agency, and as a step towards their own ideal.

Dr. E. R. Gould, Special Commissioner of the United States Labour Department, who undertook an investigation into the Scandinavian system at the request of his Government, came back a most enthusiastic supporter of the system. The Chief Constable of Gothenburg states that the change wrought by the system is like the change from night to day.

CHAPTER XIV.

TRUST COMPANIES IN BRITAIN.

THE movement for the company control of public houses, somewhat on the lines of the Scandinavian method, has made some progress in Great Britain. The number of Trust Companies in England, Wales, and Ireland, affiliated to the Central Association was (April, 1907) 33; and the number in Scotland was 5, making a total of 38 Trust Companies. The number of public houses under Trust management was 233, as compared with 206 in 1906, and 33 in 1902. The combined capital amounted to £527,000.

It must be admitted that the Trust in this country has worked under great difficulties. The Trust has no statutory authority or powers other than those of the ordinary license. It has no monopoly, and it is not in association with the local authority, nor has it the support of a strong public sympathy. The usual financial basis of the Trust company is the payment of a maximum dividend of 5 per cent. with provision for depreciation and sinking fund. Although the idea is supposed to be the elimination of private interest, the Trust offers a finan-

cial temptation quite equal to that of the average brewery share. It is doubtful if, generally speaking, the public houses run by the Trust are better conducted than the ordinary better class of public house.

The declared intention of the advocates of "Disinterested Management" is, as we have stated, to eliminate, as far as possible, personal and private interest in the sale of drink. "It is proposed to do this by authorising the licensing authorities to grant all the licenses, which they have determined to issue in a given locality, to a body of suitable persons who are prepared to undertake their disinterested management under carefully considered statutory conditions." The adoption of this system, it is claimed, would cause all pushing of the sale of drink to cease, and all questionable practices in connection with public houses to disappear. The perfect disinterestedness of those who have invested their money in these Public House Trusts is assumed with the innocence of a most unusual faith in human nature. The magistrates are to have power to reduce the number of licenses, and we are assured that the magistrates will find in the shareholders of the Trust Public Houses earnest supporters of every effort at curtailment and reduction.

The purpose of the advocates of Disinterested Management carried out to the extent of their desires is that after the expiration

of a Time Limit all licenses shall lapse, and that all such as it may be decided to renew shall be entrusted to a specially constituted body of suitable persons who would provide the capital required, upon which they would receive a moderate rate of interest. The first charge upon the profits, after payment of interest on capital, should be the formation of a reserve fund equal in amount to the capital of the managing body. The object of forming this fund would be to secure that if it were afterwards decided to abolish a license, the fund would repay the capital to the management body. It is further claimed that as the interest upon the reserve fund would go a long way towards paying the 5 per cent. return on the capital, the pecuniary interest of the company in the sale of drink would be reduced to a minimum. The profits beyond the allotment already noted should go to the National Exchequer in the first instance, and should not in any way be used to relieve the local rates. Other stated objects are that the Trust Houses should be managed so that :

1. Only the best drink that can be obtained in the open market will be sold.

2. It will not be to the interest of the manager to push the sale of intoxicants ; he will receive no commission on the sale of intoxicating liquors, but will be paid a fixed salary with commission on the sale of food and non-

intoxicants, or a bonus for good management.

3. The public houses will be refreshment-houses, and not merely drinking bars. Food and non-intoxicants will be supplied as readily as intoxicants and during the same hours.

Such in brief is the proposal of "Disinterested Management" carried out to the full extent and intention.

The Public House Trust Companies now working are efforts to embody the same principles on voluntary lines, while waiting for the legislative monopoly they desire. It must be admitted that experiments on a very small scale, mostly with country public houses, are not sufficient to justify conclusions as to what would be the results in other circumstances. One Trust public house in a town, where all the other houses are of the ordinary sort, cannot be expected to make a revolution. But when every allowance has been made for the difficulties of a partial and hampered experiment, the results of the working of the Trust Public Houses in Great Britain do not warrant the claim that the system will eliminate private interest, secure disinterested management, and reduce drinking to a minimum.

The Peoples' Refreshment House Association, which has the Bishop of Chester at its head, has sixty houses under its management, and it has been so far successful as to

pay the maximum dividend of 5 per cent. each year since 1899 ; and at the same time none of its houses has been prosecuted. The local Trust Companies affiliated to the Central Public House Association, of which there are 38 altogether, have not yet been so successful in combining temperance and dividends, or in securing either the one or the other. Two-thirds of the number have paid no dividend ; twelve cannot even make a profit ; while a fair number of the houses have become notorious by reason of more or less frequent appearances of the Company's Secretary in the Police Courts for permitting drunkenness. The sums which any of the Trust Houses have been able to hand over for purposes of public utility are negligible.

The two fatal features of the Trust system are that the incentive of personal profit is not eliminated, and effective control is impossible. A dividend of 5 per cent., with a reserve fund taken from profits, as an adequate security for the capital, is a commercial investment far above the average to be found elsewhere. The directors receive fees in addition ; in the case of the Northumberland Trust Company, the directors' fees amounted to £105 for the year 1906, out of business making a profit of only £608 6s. 1d., and unable to pay a full dividend. Both the directors and shareholders have all the interests of the directors and shareholders of

an ordinary commercial concern. The management, too, is financially interested. The profit is made on the alcohol, and the manager cannot rid himself of the feeling that the ten per cent. profit is expected by the company in order to pay the dividend and the sinking fund. The very fact that there is such generous consideration shown for the interests of the shareholders proves that the investors do not regard themselves as philanthropists who have no other motive than to promote sobriety. A satisfactory scheme of public house management would be one which kept a public house open to meet a need which existed for the time being, but looked for the profit in the decline of drinking and the social benefit which would accrue therefrom.

The claim that the Trust Companies would support the reduction of licenses is opposed to reason. If the licenses to be abolished had been worked by the Trust sufficiently long to have allowed the full invested capital to accumulate in the reserve fund, perhaps the unwillingness to surrender the license would not be great. But even then there would be the pecuniary interest of the shareholders to the extent of sacrificing a certain five per cent. for the probability of a much less remunerative investment elsewhere. But where there was not a reserve fund the motive of opposition to the abolition of licenses would be strong. If all the retail

trade were under Trust Companies there would be a body of interested shareholders as large and as selfish as the present shareholders in private liquor companies.

An even more serious objection to the Trust system than that it does not eliminate private interest is that it cannot possibly secure effective control and management of the public houses. The Trust Companies would operate over a wide area, as do the present companies, and the shareholders would be non-residential, and the directors not in personal touch with the houses. As an instance of the state of things which would prevail universally if, after the expiration of the time limit, all public houses were put under Trust management, take the case of the Northumberland Trust Company which now owns seven houses in widely separated parts of the country. It has been found impossible to supervise the houses. There is no local supervision of the management. The Secretary of the Trust is the license holder, and he is summoned for the sins of the manager of each public house. He has been repeatedly before the magistrates for offences of which he had no personal knowledge. With an extension of the number of houses under a common Trust, the difficulty of effective control would increase.

The political and municipal interests of the Trusts would be against the public wel-

fare. We have already shown that the financial stake of the shareholders would be in opposition to a popular desire to reduce facilities. The power of a Trust owning all the liquor shops in a town could be concentrated with more effect than it is possible for the "Trade" to be at present.

The proposal of "Disinterested Management" of the character we have been treating cannot be supported as either wise, desirable, or practicable. It is opposed to the whole tendency of democratic government, which is not to relegate public businesses to private associations, however good may be the intentions of the latter. No scheme of control of the retail liquor shops could be disinterested which permitted a few private persons to make profits out of the working of a public monopoly. There never could be a guarantee that the companies would be actuated by a desire to promote temperance. Once the Trust system was universally established it would become a huge private interest opposed to public welfare. The whole idea of the Trust is opposed to the principle of public responsibility for the treatment of the drink question. To hand over the licenses to associations of presumably public spirited temperance reformers is an admission by the community of its own incapacity or want of courage. The Trust idea is wrong in its moral and its economic basis. The reduction of drinking to the low-

est possible point at any given period can only be brought about by a plan which will recognise that some financial loss must be borne by the community in maintaining facilities for the satisfaction of the existing minimum demand. As we consider this point to be of importance, we may illustrate what is really meant. It is not only conceivable but highly probable that in many districts the demand for liquor shops will be of such dimensions as to prevent local veto being carried, and yet the demand will not be so large as to make the trade financially profitable. A community convinced of the need of keeping the retail sale under strict control would be wise in carrying on this non-paying trade in the way calculated to prevent abuse, rather than neglect to meet the need, which, if not satisfied under proper conditions would resort to disastrous ways. Nobody but the community could undertake such a non-paying business on any considerable scale. The Trust certainly would not do this. As an instance, it may be mentioned that when the vote of the inhabitants decided to have a liquor license at Port Sunlight, the public house was handed over to the Public House Trust. This Trust relinquished the house after some years because they could not make the interest of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the capital. There is no doubt about the convenience of the license

to the village and to visitors, but the Trust does not exist to lose money to suit the public convenience. In this case the license was continued by Messrs. Lever Bros., though doing so involved a considerable annual loss. A firm like Lever Bros., with its interests in the place, can afford to do this. But in practically every other place the community only could do that; and it would do so, if it recognised that by so doing it was preventing the demand from finding satisfaction in an unregulated club, or in some other way which would produce results socially disastrous.

The removal of the evils of drinking is not going to be done without some sacrifice, and it is not to "Disinterested Management" taking a ten per cent. profit, we must look. The community must accept the responsibility for the existence of the traffic, and it must be prepared to face temporary financial loss for the sake of future social gain.

CHAPTER XV.

PUBLIC CONTROL AND MUNICIPALISATION.

THE Licensing Bill now (April, 1908) before Parliament aims at two things: first, a reduction in the number of licensed premises, second, the restitution to the State of the monopoly value of the licenses. The first object is to be secured by a systematic reduction of the number of licenses until the number remaining conform to a fixed proportion to population; the second object is to be realised by a Time Limit, at the end of which every then existing license lapses. The Bill, very wisely we think, lays down no plans for the future regulation of the traffic, leaving that for the Parliament of fourteen years hence.

If the Bill becomes law in its present form generally, then at the end of the Time Limit what is to happen? The opportunity will be one for inaugurating a great scheme of temperance and social reform such as never was given to the nation before. Unfettered in any way by the obligation of considering any private or vested interests, the nation can begin anew to regulate and control the Liquor Traffic with all the experience of the

last four centuries of regulation to guide it. We may take it for granted that public opinion fourteen years hence will not be favourable to the State Prohibition of the liquor traffic. But it is likely that by then the sentiment in favour of Local Option will have grown to the extent of warranting Parliament in giving localities the option of voting for "license" or "no license." This Option will no doubt be restricted by safeguards to protect minorities against unreasonable tyranny. Taking it for granted that Local Option will be conferred, and allowing for the growth of temperance opinion in the meantime through the spread of education and social reforms, it is safe to predict that even then the use of the power will not materially lessen the number of licenses and the amount of the traffic which will then exist.

The question then arises, what is to be the method of future control? A number of choices will be open. The monopoly value of the license will be the property of the State. There will be the choice of licensing a private individual as at present, but adding to the cost of the license, a sum equal to the annual value of the monopoly. There will be the choice of recognising by law the Trust Companies, and conferring upon them a monopoly to work all the licenses in a district, subject of course as in the former case, to the monopoly value being paid to

the public. A third choice will be to confer the monopoly to work the licenses upon the local authority. Let us consider each of these three possible courses.

There would be no changes in the system of sale as we have it to-day, by the adoption of the first course. The only difference would be that the publican would pay a higher license duty. It is scarcely likely that this of itself would stimulate the publican to increased activity, because the increase in the license duty would only be in proportion to his increased trade due to the lessening of competition. But it is not the publican only we have to consider; an interest more selfish and more soulless than his will operate. The houses will still be mainly owned by the brewers, and every successful legislative effort to reduce the consumption of drink, and the increase of temperance from other causes, will stimulate the brewers to greater activity in pushing their sales. The onerous conditions on which the license holders have their tenancies of tied houses to-day are such as to make it difficult for the publican to make a living except by encouraging custom by doubtful and illegal attractions.

But it may be urged that the tied house system could be abolished by the licensing authority making it a condition of the license that the house should not be owned by a brewer. But even that, which is not possible, would not prevent the brewer from

getting the publican under his control. The system which prevails in Scotland and London, of brewers and dealers advancing loans to the license holders is just as effective for the brewers' and dealers' purpose. Moreover, if it were possible to ensure that license holders should be quite free from financial obligations to the brewers, the desire of the brewers to maintain their trade and profits would lead to other methods; and the formation of rings and trusts by them would place the retailer at the mercy of a monopoly for the supply. There is no escaping from the conclusion that the publican will find his profits gradually getting less, and the incentive to push his trade will increase in proportion as the rate of profit declines. To continue the system of licensing private persons, who engage in the trade to make as much money as they can, is not calculated to secure the best results from the point of view of temperance reform.

The second choice is the Trust system—but differing from the system as it is in operation to-day in so far as it will then work under public sanction, under statutory regulations, and will have a monopoly in the district it works. With these changes, we do not think the Trust system a desirable form of control, for reasons which have been fully stated in a previous chapter.

We now come to the third choice, namely, Public Control or Municipalisation.

As it is intended to deal with this proposal at some length, it is important at the outset to indicate the limits of reform expected from the Municipalisation of the Drink Traffic. The proposal is not put forward as a complete and final scheme for solving the drink question in all its aspects. We roughly grouped the chief causes of drinking under three heads: (1) industrial and social conditions; (2) social customs; (3) facilities and the method of supply. Municipalisation is put forward as a scheme for effecting reform in that proportion of drinking and drunkenness which is due to facilities and the method of supply. After all that is possible has been done by reducing facilities, either by a statutory limitation of licenses or by Local Option, there will remain a considerable volume of traffic which will have to be regulated or managed in some way. Municipalisation is the best way to control it, so as to reduce the evils and abuses to the lowest possible dimensions.

The proposal for municipal control did not originate with the Socialists. Thirty-one years ago Mr. Joseph Chamberlain put forward such a proposal before a Committee of the House of Lords. He submitted to them a well-considered scheme for the Municipalisation of the Drink Traffic in Birmingham. He was supported by resolutions of the City Council, the Board of Guardians, and the local branch of the United Kingdom

Alliance. He so impressed the Committee that they reported to Parliament in favour of legislative powers being given to Birmingham to carry out Mr. Chamberlain's scheme. The Committee considered that the scheme offered the following advantages, namely, (1) local control; (2) reduction of public houses; (3) elimination of private interest in sales; (4) better liquor; (5) removal of liquor influence from elections; (6) reduction in drunkenness; (7) relief, directly and indirectly, of the rates.

About the same time Mr. Chamberlain moved the following resolution in the House of Commons:—

That it is desirable to empower Town Councils of Boroughs under the Municipal Corporations Acts to acquire compulsorily on payment of fair compensation, the existing interests in the retail sale of intoxicating drink within their respective districts; and, thereafter, if they see fit, to carry on the trade for the convenience of the inhabitants; but so that no individual shall have any interest in or derive any profit from the sale.

This resolution was lost by a majority of 52, among those supporting it being the late Sir Wilfred Lawson, who in the course of the debate had said, "Although I do not agree with everything in this resolution, there can be no doubt that it would, if passed, be the most deadly blow that this generation has seen struck at the liquor traffic as it at present exists."

Mr. Chamberlain's plan was for the Corporation to acquire all the existing licenses at market value, and the profits he cal-

culated, after allowing for reduction of consumption, would, after payment of interest on the borrowed capital, leave sufficient to pay off the loans in ten years' time. The reasons which Mr. Chamberlain gave for preferring this scheme of Municipalisation to the Gothenburg system are interesting as bearing on the competitive claims of the Trust system and Municipalisation. He said :

In England, where we are beginning *de novo*, I would rather go to headquarters, and I believe that greater security for the conduct of the business would be afforded if it were managed by a really representative authority, subject to public control and criticism, than if it were in the hands of a semi-private trust, even although that trust might be originally established on purely philanthropic grounds.

Municipalisation is frankly based on the admission that the public house is a public convenience which the public will have. It is recognised that the trade is one which, unless strictly controlled, may lead to serious evils, but if the sale of drink be conducted under proper safeguards then it meets what public opinion considers (whatever individual opinion may be) a perfectly legitimate desire. The idea of Municipalisation, then, is to provide for the satisfaction of a reasonable indulgence in drink, but to prevent the abuse of it. The incentive of gain is the motive of all private business. Profits depend upon sales ; the business man is in trade to do as much business as he can. It

is just the same with those who are in the liquor traffic. These men are neither better nor worse than other business men. The brewer and publican do not deliberately engage in the trade to ruin their customers. But, unfortunately, the more drink they sell the more ruin they spread. This incentive of gain, this private interest in pushing the sale of drink is the great difficulty in the way of effectively regulating it. The customer with the drink-appetite finds the publican's business interest an ever present help. The publican has not only his own interest to promote, but he has in most cases the even stronger pressure of the brewer behind him. If the financial interest of the seller in the sale of drink could be eliminated, if a system could be established where it would be to the interest of everybody associated with the sale to discourage the sale, then undoubtedly, much drinking, and practically all drunkenness on licensed premises would be abolished. But, as General Neale Dow said, "We shall never settle the drink question so long as there is money in it"; and we might add, when the money is out of it, the whole problem has been by no means settled.

The reasons which support municipalisation in general apply to the Municipalisation of the Liquor Trade. The evolution of the public regulation of this traffic has followed the lines of the public regulation of other requirements. The unregulated private

control of any business produces grave evils, and is a public danger. Probably more lives are lost every year from an impure milk supply than from drinking. We have elaborate regulations to ensure a pure supply. But the private interest of the milk trade is opposed to the public interest, and at this moment the farmers and dairymen are organising an opposition to further legislative regulation. The same thing applies to the food supply. Adulterated food and diseased meat are sold to the public in spite of inspectors—and all for the profit of the dealers, not because they desire to kill the people.

The unregulated competition of commercialism, the motive of which is private profit, was responsible for the terrible industrial conditions of the pre-factory legislation days. The Public Health Acts, which aim at ensuring sanitary conditions for tenants and the public generally, have been necessary because it was proved that the personal interest of the property owner was against the public welfare, and that he would permit grossly insanitary conditions to exist for the sake of saving his own pocket at the cost of the health or lives of others. The safety of public health has demanded the State interference with private enterprise in almost every business. It was not found to be safe to entrust a body of shareholders to form a water company without protect-

ing the consumers by elaborate regulations. But the conflict of interest between the private owners of public services and the community has shown itself not only as a danger to public health, but in the form of serious public inconvenience. Hence, private monopolies like gas works, tramways, railway companies, etc., are permitted to work only under conditions and limitations imposed by the State for the protection of the community. Why are those regulations imposed? Simply and solely because the motive of the companies is to make profit; and the incentive of profit leads to the sacrifice of public convenience and the merciless exploitation of the public.

All regulation and control of private enterprise, whether it has taken the form of Factory Laws, Public Health Acts, Food Adulteration Regulations, Company Law, Railway Control or whatever other form, has been to protect the public against private greed, which if left unchecked would make the most necessary public service a danger to the community. In no respect, unless it be in degree, does the regulation of the Drink Traffic differ from other forms of State regulation of private business in the public interests.

The illustration and the appeal to precedent in support of the Municipalisation of the Drink Traffic may be carried still further. Regulation was the first form of State inter-

ference with private enterprise. But regulation has never succeeded in preventing abuses and in completely protecting the public. Scarcely a session of Parliament passes without additional Factory Acts, intended to strengthen existing powers for the protection of the workers against the financial interest of the employer. Local authorities every year promote Bills to obtain more effective powers to compel property owners to give protection to their tenants and the public. The Board of Trade is ever increasing its authority over private companies, and these companies are vigorously opposing further regulation, because it touches their profits. But regulation upon regulation never secures complete protection, nor a satisfactory measure of public convenience. So the State and the Local Authority have gone beyond regulation, and, recognising that the antagonism of interest between the private owners and the public was the root of the difficulty, have eliminated all private financial gain by the public acquisition of the ownership and control of certain concerns. The need for regulation was private profit; the reason for public ownership was the impossibility of mere regulation, however stringent, securing satisfaction for the public, so long as private persons could make money out of public requirements. This demand for the supersession of private ownership owing to

the failure of regulation, continues and grows. At this moment Royal Commissions and Committees are sitting to enquire into the questions of Canal and Railway Nationalisation, and these demands are coming from the commercial classes who, tired of trying to get concessions from the companies, see that the motive of private profit must be eliminated from railway management before the public interest can be the supreme consideration. The Drink Traffic is completely analogous to all these other businesses and services which the State has had to regulate and ultimately own and control. Every one of the trades mentioned, if left uncontrolled, is capable of becoming as great a public danger as an unregulated Drink Traffic. The argument for State or public regulation and ownership of public services applies therefore with equal force to the Drink Traffic.

CHAPTER XVI.

MUNICIPALISATION (*continued*).

THERE are further points from experience and precedent which support the proposal to municipalise the drink traffic. The public ownership of services has been advocated on two grounds, namely, that the particular trade was of such a character that it should not be left to private control, and that the trade was a monopoly. Both these reasons support with great force the proposal to municipalise the drink traffic. The liquor trade is one which, in the interests of the community, should not be encouraged. Therefore it is obviously most foolish to allow it to remain in the hands of people who have no motive for being in the trade except to push it for profit. The public must provide for the satisfaction of the demand for liquor in moderation, so long as the people consider moderate drinking to be a legitimate and reasonable thing. Further, the liquor trade is largely a monopoly, both in its productive and its distributive departments. Figures as to the proportion of free to tied houses are not obtainable, but it is not probably outside the

facts to put down the proportion of tied houses at 85 per cent. of the whole number. How brewing is rapidly passing into the hands of the big concerns may be seen from the following figures :—

NUMBER OF BREWERS "FOR SALE."

Years	1880	1890	1900	1906
Number ..	19040	12000	6290	5025

The argument that only such businesses as deal in a single commodity, or those where there is no dependence upon the whims of fashion, are suitable for public management, supports the municipalisation of the liquor traffic. The drink traffic is a simple one, in the sense that a man knows exactly what he wants, and the publican knows exactly what to give him, which of course is not necessarily what the man wants. No great variety of liquor is required to be stocked, and the liquor, we are told, gains virtue with age. The liquor traffic, from every point of view, by the test of every argument for general municipalisation, is eminently suitable for municipalisation.

We admit that if the Licensing Bill now before the country becomes law, it will make it difficult during the working of the time limit to interfere with the operation of the statutory reduction and the compensation scheme. If an experiment in Municipalisation were to be tried, it would involve the acquisition by the local authority of all the licenses in its area. This would mean direct financial payment to the license

holders. But in view of the great importance of the public being in possession of all possible experience when they are called upon at the end of the time limit to decide the further method of control, it would be invaluable if in the meantime we could have one or two enterprising and competent local authorities try experiments in complete municipal control. It would be essential that the municipality have a complete monopoly of the retail sale in its area ; a municipal public house, surrounded by others in private hands, is useless for forming conclusions.

If a municipality desired in the meantime to try such an experiment, Parliamentary sanction might be given for the acquisition of all the licenses by the commutation of the unexpired value of the licenses. A vote of the inhabitants would be necessary, so that the experiment might be assured of public support. We have not much faith, however, in Parliament permitting any interference with the time limit scheme when it is once in operation ; and, as we have stated already, the period of the time limit may be very profitably employed in educating public opinion, and getting it ready for action when the way for democratic control is free from all financial difficulties.

At the end of the time limit, all licenses automatically lapse, and the extent and method of control of the future traffic ought

to be determined by the people. We do not think it would be wise for Parliament then to impose upon every locality the obligation to municipalise the retail traffic. To do that would be to invite disaster. In such a matter, admittedly beset with difficulties, it is important to move cautiously. The plan we would suggest is that the power of option to municipalise should be given, and this should be operative only after a very decisive vote of the inhabitants in favour. This option would be one of many. If municipalisation were approved by such a strong vote in its support, it would indicate the existence in the locality of a temperance sentiment and public spirit without which initial experiments might prove unsuccessful.

Temperance reform must follow on the lines of all real progress. The steps taken must be (1) gradual; (2) democratic; (3) moral. They must be gradual so that we do not move more quickly than experience justifies. They must be democratic so as to train the people to a sense of their duty and responsibility for social conditions. They must be moral in the sense that the proposed changes do not violate the popular sense of liberty and justice.

Parliament should lay down the broad lines on which the Municipalisation of the Drink Traffic shall be carried out, but inside these, it is most important that liberty to experiment, liberty to make mistakes, liberty

to rectify them, should be allowed to the locality. Above all else we want, in connection with the treatment of the Drink Traffic, that experience which can only come from actual test. Only experiment can prove or disprove the theoretic arguments for and against the proposal in the abstract, though it is true that our experience of public control in general has an instructive bearing on this particular question.

The constitution of the local authority which is to manage the liquor traffic will be a matter for serious consideration. We are opposed to the creation of a special authority for the purpose. If that plan was adopted the elections would result in a contest between fanatical teetotallers and the publicans, the former of whom would seek to discredit municipal management in the interests of prohibition, and the latter to secure the same end in the interests of the "trade." The Council is the proper authority to undertake this work, and as its duties are so varied, and the interests of the citizens who elect the Councils so diverse, the drink question would only be one of the influences deciding the election. If it were considered desirable, the Council might have power to form a statutory Committee for this purpose, with liberty to co-opt outside persons, though this is neither democratic in principle, nor calculated to secure that efficiency of management which comes from

a sense of direct contact with the electorate. The whole tendency of local government is towards the unification of administration under one body. This must, by and bye, necessitate a considerable increase in the number of members of the larger councils, and the entrusting of departments of work to the Committees without any close supervision by the general body. This is in no way undesirable. On the contrary it is likely to conduce to more effective control, as the members of the Councils, restricted to one or a very few departments of public work, will be able to keep more thoroughly in touch with the work. And their direct responsibility to the electorate will be in no way impaired.

The question arises as to what Councils should have this power conferred or withheld, and we would suggest that the idea which should determine this, is to make the unit or area of management co-extensive with the boundaries of the Town, Urban, or Parish Council. This will attain two objects, both important from the point of view of efficient management. The area will be co-extensive with the local patriotic spirit, and it will not be too wide to secure effective oversight. Parish Councils we would not exclude, for, in our opinion, the rural parish is a convenient area, and the parish Councils are quite competent to do this work. It would be no more difficult

work for a Parish Council to run a public house than for a committee of working men to manage a village co-operative store, which they are successfully doing in hundreds of cases to-day. The County Council, for many reasons, should have no authority in this matter. The area of its jurisdiction is too great, and the difficulty of securing democratic membership would be to the advantage of the brewing fraternity.

The Council, or its Committee, would frame regulations as to time of opening and closing ; it would fix prices and appoint the managers ; it would purchase the stock ; it would in fact have as much freedom of action in management as a Tramway Committee, which works within the four corners of its Parliamentary powers. The Licensing Magistrates might retain a supervising authority over the Council in so far as to ensure that the statutory conditions and limitations were not overstepped.

The elimination of private interest in the sale of drink demands of course that the servants in the municipal drink trade shall have no incentive to push the sale. If the public and the Council have imbibed the essential idea of municipal liquor control, namely, that success is to be measured in losses and not profits on the drink, there will be little difficulty in gaining the sympathetic co-operation of the servants. Security of employment in some occupation under the Council should

be guaranteed so long as the servants faithfully carry out their duties. To guard against the possibility of corruption the retail salesman should have nothing whatever to do with buying the liquor.

There are two other very important questions which demand consideration,—the questions of profits, and of attractions. There are those who advocate the municipalisation of the drink traffic as a means of securing larger profits for the community. Mr. Chamberlain made much of this. We are inclined to think that the likelihood of huge profits from the municipal public house is much exaggerated. The monopoly value of the license will already have been appropriated by the State. This is the annual value which now goes to the brewer. The profits which a municipality might hope to make would have to come from the sale of drink. The frequency of the transfer of licenses now does not seem to indicate that the profits of the publican are very princely. The balance sheets of the Public House Trusts confirm this view. Few of them have so far succeeded in making any surplus at all. It must be remembered that the very reason for the municipalisation of the drink traffic is to reduce the sale of drink to the lowest possible dimensions. Standing expenses will remain the same though the sale of liquor falls, and the profits from the drink sold in the municipal public houses must

decline if the object of municipalisation is realised. In fact, the real test of the success of municipalisation must be the reduction of profits, and every loss upon the year's trading in liquor must be welcomed as an evidence of the success of the scheme. The community will look for the compensation for this loss of public money in the social advantage of a soberer people, much in the same way as we find the return for the expenditure upon drainage in the better health of the community. When all the licenses in a district are under municipal control it will be easy for the Council to close those houses which become unnecessary, or, in other words, to keep facilities equal to a strictly regulated demand.

The profits from other causes would be less under municipal management. The quality of the liquor sold would be of a better and purer character, and the wages paid to the servants would, we hope, be higher than they are now under the private traders. But assuming that the trade was profitable, then the question would arise as to the disposal of these profits. The method advocated in some quarters is to put the local profits into a national fund from which distribution shall be made to the localities in grants proportionate to the population, and not in proportion to the profits the locality earns. It is also suggested that prohibition areas shall receive such grants, so

that all incentive to continue the traffic for the sake of profits shall be removed. The grants received shall be spent by the localities in providing counter attractions to the public houses. The system adopted by the Public House Trusts is to hand over the profits (if any) to local charities and religious bodies, but to exclude from participation all objects which can claim assistance from the rates. The idea of prohibiting the local rates from benefiting from the profits of the local drink traffic is to remove the possibility of the ratepayers encouraging the traffic from financial motives.

The question as to whether the opportunities for social intercourse and recreation ought to be provided inside the public house or elsewhere as a counter attraction, is one on which differences of opinion exist. The most forceful objection to divorcing all attractions from the public houses, and giving to them the air of penitentiaries, is that if men who take drink in a social way, cannot have it in a public house with reasonable comfort, they will form clubs to satisfy their desires. There is a compromise possible between the two extremes. It would be undesirable to have attractions in connection with the public house, which might draw persons to whom drinking was no temptation, but while confining the business of the public house to the provision of refreshments (alcoholic and temperance) it would be in-

advisable to make it so unattractive and repulsive as to drive people who desired alcoholic drinks to less desirable places. But for those who want social intercourse, and to whom the obtaining of liquor is of no account, institutions must be provided; and the more attractive such are, the better for temperance reform.

Although we do not desire to claim too much for the partial experiments in municipal public house keeping which have been tried, it may be interesting to describe briefly two of these experiments.

The first municipal public house was that of the Birmingham Corporation at their Waterworks in the Elan Valley in Radnorshire. The question of the liquor supply for the navvies engaged in this undertaking was settled by the Waterworks Committee of the Birmingham Corporation themselves applying for a license for a canteen, which was granted on the condition that a manager was appointed who should be paid a fixed wage, and who should have no financial interest in the sale of drink. The Committee framed very stringent rules as to the conduct of the canteen. No credit was given; no music or games were allowed; the bar was closed during working hours; the amount of liquor a man might have in one evening was limited; women were not permitted to enter the bar. The financial results were remarkable. In three and a half years the *net* profits amounted

to £3,262. These profits were devoted to the maintenance of the village institutions, the school, the hospital, and the public rooms (which proved a very effective counter attraction to the canteen). The universal testimony is that the management of the canteen greatly lessened the amount of drunkenness as compared with what might have been expected under the ordinary system. The Chief Constable of the county stated, "Drunkenness in the Elan Village is undoubtedly suppressed through the stringent rules and measures adopted by the canteen, and further I have no hesitation in saying that it is attributable to these regulations."

The Harrogate Corporation tried a similar experiment at their Waterworks at Scargill, six miles from Harrogate. The rules were very similar to those adopted at Elan, and the results were equally satisfactory. The net profits averaged from £700 a year. So little drunkenness and rowdyism prevailed in the village that the services of a policeman were never required during the three years.

These experiments prove that a Corporation Committee can run a public house; that the elimination of private profit reduces drunkenness; that the profits of the trade may be put to more useful purposes. But beyond this, they furnish little help towards the treatment of the drink control question in our centres of population.

CHAPTER XVII.

ADVANTAGES AND OBJECTIONS.

WE may now sum up some of the advantages which would come to the community from the municipalisation of the drink traffic.

It would place the control of the traffic completely in the hands of the people of the locality. It would confer complete local option.

It would ensure that the traffic which remained after local option had done all it could to reduce facilities, would be carried on free from the incentive of private gain.

It would free the temperance sentiment of the locality, and enable the dimensions of the traffic to be kept under strict control.

It would remove the influence of the liquor interest from politics.

It would give full local option in regard to hours of opening and closing, Sunday closing, closing on election days.

It would give freedom to the locality to make conditions as to the sale of liquor to young persons.

It would dissociate gambling and immorality from public houses.

It would give back to the community any profits which might be made, and these would be used to counteract the drink temptation.

It would ensure better conditions of labour for the persons employed in the trade.

It is a scheme in harmony with all the economic and social tendencies of the time, which point to the wisdom of public control as the means to eliminate the admitted evils of private profit-making.

It is a scheme, which by frankly recognising that the demand for drink must be met, proposes to meet it in such a way as to satisfy all reasonable desire while preventing excessive drinking.

It is a scientific and harmonious scheme of Temperance reform, which while adapted to present needs, is capable of progressive re-adaptation with the growth of public sentiment on the question.

We propose now to deal with a number of objections which have been put forward to the Municipalisation of the Drink Traffic.

1. *Four centuries of effort to regulate the traffic have proved that it cannot be regulated. It must be destroyed.*

Efforts to destroy the Drink Traffic have scarcely succeeded more brilliantly than legislative regulation. Common sense dictates that when a thing cannot be removed it must be endured as best we can. Regulation has failed to remove the evils of the traffic for the same reason that regulation has failed to remove the evils and abuses from other trades. Past regulation has never got to the root cause. It has left the

traffic to be controlled and managed by deeply interested parties who have been interested in opposing regulation. Municipalisation would remove the cause of the failure of mere regulation of private interest.

2. *The elimination of private profit would not remove the desire to drink.*

It was never suggested that it would. The limitations of municipalisation have been frankly admitted. It is not a panacea. All that is claimed for it is, that it is the best and only practical way of dealing with the traffic which the public say shall exist after the powers of restriction have been fully exercised. The elimination of private gain will remove all the proportion of drinking which is due to encouragement under the system of private license.

3. *Municipalisation would substitute public cupidity for the present private interest.*

This is the only serious objection urged by opponents of municipalisation of the Liquor Traffic. If there were the prospects of large profits which might ease the burden of the ratepayers it would be a temptation to an ignorant and short-sighted community to encourage the traffic. But it would be the duty of Parliament, in laying down general conditions, to prevent the possibility of this abuse. Such suggestions as have already been made for the disposal of profits would be a sufficient safeguard. The success of any scheme depends upon the intelligence

and sentiment behind it. It is reasonable to assume that a community which municipalised the Drink Traffic would do so because it desired to reduce the evils of it to a minimum. This motive would be a guarantee that the traffic would be conducted in such a way as to secure the desired effect. No community could afford to encourage drinking. It would, if it did, very soon discover that this was a suicidal policy; that the expense of dealing with the results of the abuse cost more than any profit derived from the trade.

4. *The Municipalisation of the Drink Traffic would corrupt local politics and make this question the dominating issue at all elections.*

This objection is akin to the last. He is possessed of a vivid imagination who can picture the drink interest exercising a greater influence in local and national politics than it does to-day. The reason for this is that the brewers and the publicans have all their interests centred in the trade, and they fight with all the desperation that selfishness can generate. But if the traffic were municipalised, no elector would have a special financial interest in the traffic. Each individual's financial interest would be infinitesimal. He would have a far greater interest in keeping the traffic under strict control for the sake of the police and poor rate, as well as for the general welfare. The drink question would be but one of the many interests the

elector would have, and his interest in that would be merged in the general questions of municipal government. The addition of this work to the duties of the local authority would attract men of public spirit into the public service, and the community would realise the need of such men for such an important work. The Municipalisation of the Drink Traffic would liberate local government from the influence of the men who now make "their trade their politics."

5. *It would implicate every citizen in such an unholy traffic.*

It would do this to no greater extent than every citizen is implicated to-day. We cannot denude ourselves of participation in the traffic. The liquor traffic is the largest contributor to the national revenue, and every teetotaler is implicated to that extent. The Temperance party are unanimous in supporting the transfer of the monopoly value of the licenses to the community; that is, they demand that they and their fellow citizens shall own the public house licenses. But we do not blame the teetotaler for being anxious to own public house licenses. It is a duty he cannot escape. So it is with the municipalisation. The duty of every citizen is to help to make the best of things he may not like but cannot abolish. It is the duty of the teetotaler to support that scheme of control of the liquor traffic which offers the best prospect of reducing its evils to the lowest dimensions. If municipalisation will

do this, then the teetotaller who prevents this plan from being adopted is responsible for all the evils of the traffic which continue to exist, and which might have been removed by adopting the suggested course. We do not get rid of our responsibility for an evil by refusing to control it. We neglect our duty, and we are morally responsible for the consequences of the neglect.

6. *The drink would be the same evil thing served for profit or for the public "good."*

No, it would not be the same evil thing. At least we hope not. Unless the municipal public house sold more wholesome drink than is often retailed now, it is possible that the municipal drink question would be an influence to some extent at the local elections. But this is one of the many silly objections to the proposal. It is not a question of whether drink is good or bad, whether State prohibition is better than Local Option; the question is whether, if we must have public houses, it is better they should be owned by the people or by the brewers.

7. *It would give greater respectability to drinking*

No. The fact that it had been placed under public control because it was liable to be a serious evil, and that the sale was hedged round with so many regulations, would be a standing proof that it was a trade which required very careful watching to keep it respectable.

8. *It would not be a permanent settlement of the drink question.*

We sincerely hope not. We claim no finality for it. But we do maintain that it will assist further temperance reform. The semi-public control in Sweden and Norway has done this. The system has encouraged temperance to such an extent that some of the towns no longer require the presence of the liquor shop. Municipalisation would not fasten the liquor traffic on the community any more than the building of a fever hospital may be said to fasten small-pox on the community. An intelligent people would willingly sacrifice any small capital which might be invested in public houses, if the temperance sentiment had become so widespread that the need for the houses no longer existed.

There is no fatal objection against the municipalisation of the drink traffic. It is a proposal eminently calculated to appeal to the moderate men of all classes—the men who, while prepared to support any proposal which may lessen excessive drinking, are not willing to restrict the traffic so as to make it difficult or impossible to satisfy a reasonable desire. The scheme has the support of the most impartial of living temperance reformers—Lord Peel, the chairman of the Royal Commission on Licensing. Speaking at the third annual meeting of the Central Temperance Legislation Board, October, 1902,

he said :—

Publichouse Trust Companies he candidly owned he did not like. It was said that the aim was the elimination of private profit. True, the man behind the counter of a Trust public-house might have no personal interest in the sale of liquor, but a number of other private individuals would profit, and 5 per cent. was not a bad return on capital in these days. If this trust extended, the diminution of licenses would be rendered even more difficult. If he were driven to the point he would rather seek a solution in municipal than in private management. He would like to see some great city like Manchester, Liverpool, or Birmingham, to which the power was legally entrusted—giving a time notice to all the public-houses within its boundaries, at the end of which time the municipalities would have a free hand to deal with the houses as they thought fit and work them, not for the benefit of the city, so far as the profits were concerned, but for the better management of the city itself. He had great faith in the municipalities of the country.

It may be that public opinion is not yet ripe for any extensive experiment on the lines we have been suggesting, but the time is certainly most favourable for an energetic educational work to fit the people for their serious responsibilities in this matter of the public control of the Drink Traffic.

The concentration of the retail sale of liquor in the hands of the community would probably lead to the municipal or national control of the sources of supply.

The sale of liquor in clubs would require to be strictly regulated ; but with ample facilities for social recreation, provided by the municipality, the need for private institutions of such a character would almost disappear.

CHAPTER XIX

CONCLUSION.

THE treatment of the Drink Evil is no longer left to the Temperance organisations. The responsibility for it is felt by all sections of society. In this recognition of the evil and of social responsibility is the hope of temperance reform.

There is no short cut to universal abstinence. The relation of the drink question to the whole social problem is now being recognised by reformers of all schools. In so far as we elevate the ideals of the people, lessen the strenuousness of commercial and industrial life, improve the surroundings of the poor, increase their leisure and provide rational entertainment, so far shall we be working most effectively for temperance reform.

At the same time, the evils of the drink traffic may be lessened, indeed reduced to a minimum, by the elimination of the incentive of private gain, and by the removal of other temptations and encouragements to drink. The schemes of reform which we have advocated in this little volume are not put forward as proposals for the immediate establishment of a teetotal Utopia. They take facts and

conditions as they are, and seek to apply to them the methods suggested by experience. In such a great question as this the wisest of us are but as learners. It is a wise policy to hasten slowly, to be guided by experience; and all that is claimed for our proposals is that taken together they form a harmonious and scientific scheme of temperance reform, eminently practicable. If carried out, they will prepare the way for greater possibilities.

APPENDIX I.

Resolution carried on 20th September, 1907, at the meeting of the German Socialist Congress, held at Essen.

"The dangers to the workmen arising from alcoholism have grown with the development of Capitalism. All these conditions which have helped to make him poorer have also tended to increase his desire to drink too much, and have made the satisfaction of this desire more dangerous,—such conditions, for example, as excessive hours of work, insufficient pay, and insanitary dwellings and workshops. Through this industrial and social disorganisation, and the drinking habits thereby engendered, the workman is forced and accustomed to the inordinate use of alcohol. This habit of drinking has also this peculiarity, that when it becomes confirmed, he loses the power any longer to control it. The middle-class Temperance advocate, as a rule, looks on drink and his own evil habit as the cause of the drunkard's misfortune, and—not wholly without design—he ignores any study of the original industrial and social conditions in which the man's thirst arose. On the other hand, he tries by coercive and penal laws, to force the so-called evil will of the drunkard, and, as a consequence of such laws, the latter has to pay twice over for a guilt originally brought on by the conditions of the society under which he lives. Capitalism and the State, the partners of responsibility, have only this amount of interest in the drink question, that they suffer harm through the ruin of the workman and his diminished productive power.

THEREFORE THIS CONGRESS RESOLVES—

"That the evils of alcohol can neither be removed nor palliated by coercive or penal laws nor by the imposition of restrictive taxation. Such coercive laws only amount in the end to restrictive legisla-

tion aimed at the poorer class of the community, while the rich easily escape from their consequences. The drunkard ought not to be surrendered to the lawyer, but, like every other sick person, should be taken in hand by the physician. Public homes for inebriates under medical superintendence should be erected and supported out of public funds. The limitation of public houses will only drive the drunkard from open indulgence in the tavern to private drinks in his own home. Taxes on the lighter alcoholic drink only force on an increased consumption of brandy. But the higher the tax on brandy, the more the poorer people who cannot to any large extent diminish its consumption, are plundered.

“As a means of combating this evil, the Congress recommends:—(1) Shortening of the working day to 8 hours at most. (2) The abolition of night work, or at least reasonable shifts of duty at night with sufficient intervals of rest. (3) Abolition of the truck system in alcohol. (4) Abolition of grocers' licenses and small clubs. (5) Increased sanitation of the workroom and more humane methods of work. (6) Protective legislation for children, young people and women. (7) Adequate wages. (8) Abolition of those protective taxes which increase the cost of land and living. (9) Extension of public schools in accordance with the resolution of the Mannheim Conference. (10) A thorough Housing scheme with People's Palaces, reading halls, and public recreation grounds. (11) Also, the Trade Unions are recommended to get rid of everything that encourages drinking in their meetings, while at the same time, by word and writing, they enlighten the children and young people as to the mischievous effects arising from the misuse of alcohol. Children must be prevented from being served with alcohol. Not only then will they engage in the old conflict against the real evils of drinking, but the class conscious political and industrial organi-

sations of the working class movement will seek to improve their industrial condition ; and, instead of seeking, in the misuse of alcohol, solace and forgetfulness, they will encourage a fight against Capitalism. As a result of this conflict they hope to abolish poverty and industrial enslavement, and to find contentment, satisfaction, and joy."

Resolution carried unanimously at the Austrian Socialist Congress, held at Vienna, 13th November, 1903.

"This Congress recognises in the drinking habits of the people a serious obstacle in the way of the successful prosecution of the Labour struggle and an immense drawback in the way of efficient Socialist organisation. No ways should therefore be left untried of grappling with the serious evil.

"The first way of working in this direction is to improve the economic environment of the people ; and in order that this may be effective, it is necessary to enlighten the people on the injurious and destructive effects of alcohol.

"The Congress therefore recommends to all its branches and to every comrade to encourage every movement that tends to discourage the drinking habit, and to abolish, as an important step towards this result, the sale of drink at all meetings of the party. The comrades who are total abstainers are recommended specially to take part in the agitation in the temperance societies ; and these latter on their part ought to take care that members do not neglect their duty to their political and industrial organisations."

APPENDIX II.

MODERN CONDITIONS OF LABOUR AND DRINKING.

To ascertain to what extent workmen break time through drink, the writer addressed the following four questions to a number of representative commercial men and Trade Union officials.

The questions were :—

- No. 1.—What percentage of your men are absent from work on a Monday morning, on the average, through week-end drinking ?
- No. 2.—Has there been a tendency to less broken time and greater sobriety among the men during the last twenty years, and, if so, what, in your opinion, is the reason ?
- No. 3.—Do you think the discipline of modern industry, requiring the close attendance of the men at their duties, is conducive to less drinking ?
- No. 4.—What percentage of your men are annually discharged through drinking ?

The replies given in regard to a syndicate in a textile trade, employing 5,000 men, every one of whom is a Trade Unionist, were as follows :—

- No. 1.—Not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
- No. 2. Yes. Drink evil very marked at one time. Twenty years ago it was a distinct evil.
- No. 3.—Better type of employé ; increased wages (20 per cent. up in 20 years) ; employment more regular ; discipline keener.
- No. 4.—In six months of 1907 only eight dismissals through drink.

A City Tramways Manager, with 1,050 workmen, replies :—

- No. 1.—Cases unknown.

No. 2.—Company management ended in 1902. Drink was a much greater evil then. Corporation management, by virtue of instituting better conditions (much less hours and actually increased wages) obtained better discipline, better type of men, and quickly broke up the drink evil. Sobriety of men now excellent.

No. 3.—Discipline and close attendance begets a better type of workman when accompanied also by better conditions.

No. 4.—In 1907.—4 cases.

An engineering firm (Manchester), employing nearly 2,000 men, reply :—

No. 1.—Absent 1·5. Through drink :—None.

No. 2.—Undoubtedly so ; due, I think, to a desire for a better condition, which has been hastened by education, the creation of ideals, the healthier enjoyments catered for, the facilities of travelling, and the desire of possession.

No. 3.—Yes. Employers cannot afford to have machinery standing idle through the non-attendance of drinking men when steady and reliable men are requisite. Now-a-days, men have come more into line, due to strict supervision and discipline, which is enforced to a greater extent than formerly. Absence from work or neglect of duty entails dismissal, and workmen realise the difficulty of getting fresh employment under those conditions.

No. 4.—Two only were discharged for drunkenness during 1907.

The General Manager of one of the largest English railways, who made a very close enquiry into the questions, replied :—

No. 1.—No actual data is available ; but the answer is “ practically nil.”

No. 2.—Sobriety has certainly increased amongst the Company's employés during the period mentioned. This is considered to be largely due to improvement in the general conditions of life and education,

the spread of Temperance principles, and the exercise of a stricter discipline over the staff.

No. 3.—This is dealt with in the reply to the preceding question.

No. 4.—The approximate percentage of men annually discharged for drunkenness is '09.

The General Secretary of the largest Trade Union in the Iron Trade replied :—

No. 1.—Probably from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 per cent.

No. 2.—There has been a great improvement in the last 20 years, I think, mainly due to education. But there is another thing, specialisation. At one time, as you know, we had all-round mechanics, who used to shift about from one place to another, and they had a good deal more of the independent spirit prevailing amongst them, than there is among those specialised and tied to a particular operation, conscious all the time of helplessness outside that operation. This has had, therefore, a tendency to greater sobriety, and, at the same time, greater timidity. As to whether one good balances the other evil that is a matter that I will leave to you to consider.

No. 3.—I should say that probably you are right about discipline as to effect as stated. But while discipline may be conducive to less drinking during working time, I am afraid it has a contrary effect at other times. I mean to say, that the man who is drilled to discipline at work during the day is not unlikely to be a very self-relying sort of chap away from work.

No. 4.—Must be very small.

A coal owner (Scotland) employing over 4,000 men, replies as follows :—

No. 1.—The percentage of our miners absent from work on Monday morning is larger after pay Saturday (which is fortnightly), but, on the whole, can be put at 10 per cent.

No. 2.—Our Managers do not think there is a tendency

to less broken time and greater sobriety among the workmen during the last 20 years. Sobriety or the reverse depends greatly on rate of wages. At present wages are high, miners making 8s. and 9s. per day, and having more to spend. They spend too much on drink when wages are high.

No. 3.—The discipline of modern industry does not apply so much to miners as to other classes of workmen, engineers, etc. They are the most independent men on the face of the earth, and, though a miner is off work, he is not dismissed. His working place is there, and unless it falls greatly behind through idle time, he does as he pleases. I would say, however, that where machines work the coal, instead of the men, the miners who attend the machines are much more steady, as they must be out regularly, or the machines would stand, and great expense would be incurred.

No. 4.—We don't dismiss them for drinking, so can't give a percentage.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance, on October 15th, 1907, Mr. Lloyd George, M.P., said: "It was found from enquiries amongst employers, that on Monday morning, about 25 to 75 per cent. of their workpeople did not turn up owing to drink, and when they did come back to work they had muddy intellects and impaired vitality." Mr. Lloyd George afterwards corrected himself: "I ought to have said 5 to 75 per cent. Whatever I actually said that is what I meant to say. Seventy-five per cent. is an outside figure, and there are not many of these. But 25 per cent. is reported to the Board of Trade by employers in many cases; in other instances the percentage sinks to 5."

The "Birmingham Daily Post," on October 17th, the "Scotsman," of October 18th, the "Yorkshire Evening Post," of October 18th and 21st, and the "Morning Advertiser," of October 25th, published reports of investigations made into the accuracy of Mr. Lloyd George's statement. No employer could be found to confirm Mr. Lloyd George's statement.

APPENDIX III.

SHORTER HOURS AND TEMPERANCE.

Sir John Brunner (Brunner, Mond, and Co.) in reply to an enquiry as to the effect of the Eight Hours Day on sobriety, has kindly supplied us with a large amount of striking testimony. He says:—

“ It is impossible to show the improvement by actual figures, but everyone who has known the works long enough to be able to compare the old conditions with the new, is agreed as to the immense change for the better. The loss of time under the old conditions was almost entirely caused by insobriety.

“ Since the introduction of shorter hours, the time lost by the men has greatly declined, and for 1906 was as follows:—

Tradesmen	Other daymen.	Shiftmen.
Days per year.	Days per year.	Days per year.
0·2	0·3	0·4

“ In 1892 (before the adoption of shorter hours), the lost time was:—

Tradesmen..	12·6 days.
Other Daymen	6·6 days.
Shift men	2·9 days.”

Sir John Brunner gives very striking figures, showing the improved health, the growth of the Co-operative Societies, etc., since the adoption of the Shorter Working Day.

Sir William Mather (Mather and Platt, Salford Iron Works) has very kindly supplemented by recent facts the information he published in 1894, as to the results of his experience of the Eight Hours Day. After twelve months' experience, the departmental managers wrote :

“ During the past twelve months I am glad to be able to report none of my men have come to work under the

influence of drink. The case in this respect formerly was bad."

"I have no fault to find with the men as to steadiness and sobriety. There is great improvement in that respect."

Sir William Mather (writing to us 14 years later, January 14th, 1908) says :—

"The experience of the foremen given in 1894 may be taken as the present condition of habit and conduct of the men. Notwithstanding the fluctuations in employment, and the changing of men from time to time, consequent on the state of trade, our foremen inform me now that it is rare indeed that we have to complain of any conduct arising from drink.

"Our works were at one time beset with publichouses, being situated in the most densely populated and poorest parts of the town of Salford. During the last 15 years many public-houses have been abolished in the borough and during the last five years at least 50 have succumbed to the better habits of working men. *Pari passu* with the movement, the number of places of amusement, at which there is no drink license, has more than doubled, and the drinking places are decidedly less frequented. We are informed that men are now accompanied by their wives and children in enjoying the amusements offered, whereas, in resorting to the public-house, the men were alone. We have a large institute connected with the works in Salford, in which are carried on various societies established by the men themselves, such as "ambulance classes," and the "Pleasant Sunday Afternoons," "Band of Hope," etc., which, though not confined to the work-people, are largely supported by them. One of our Managers in a very superior position, who came to me as a boy, and who knows the history of these works for the last 30 years, states :—'All the questions in Mr. Snowden's letter as to improvement in sobriety may safely be answered in the affirmative.' "

INDEX.

- Accrington, 136.
- Aged Poor, Royal Commission on, 90.
- Arrests for Drunkenness, 4.
- Asquith, Mr., 138.
- Austrian Socialists, 32 ; Appendix I.
- Bands of Hope, 23.
- Beer, Origin of, 18.
- Belgian Socialists, 32.
- Bessbrook, 134.
- Birmingham, 163, 181.
- Booth, Chas., 59, 87, 90, 92, 95.
- Brewers for Sale, 172.
- Broadbent, Sir William, 13.
- Broken Time ; Appendix II.
- Bronardel, Dr., 14.
- Bunge, Prof., 12.
- Burns, Dr. Dawson, 34, 103, 108.
- Burns, Mr. J., 48, 55, 87.
- Burt, Mr. Thos., 28.
- Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H., 93.
- Canada, 127.
- Cancer, 14.
- Causes of Drinking, 71.
- Chamberlain, Mr. J., 90, 163, 178.
- Chancellor of Exchequer, 74, 109.
- Chemical Workers, 64.
- Children, Deficient, 11.
- Clubs, 138.
- Coats' Syndicate, 107.
- Coleridge, Lord, 7.
- Consumption of Drink, in U.S.A., '125 ; in Canada
127 ; in New Zealand, 130.
- Convictions, 61.
- Co-operative Societies, 26.

- Coroners on Drink, 7.
- Cotton Trade and Employment, 104.
- Cotton Workers and Health, 62.
- Crime, 4.
- Dawson, Rev. W. J., 114.
- Deaths from Drink, 14.
- Disease, Drink and, Medical Report on, 9.
- Disinterested Management, 139.
- Drink Bill, 34, 103; in United States, 125; New Zealand, 131.
- Drunkenness and Crime, 4; Arrests, 4; in Liverpool, 5.
- Durham, Housing in, 61.
- Elan Canteen, 181.
- Employment, 85, 103.
- Epilepsy, 10.
- Expenditure upon Drink, 34. (See Wages and Drink Bill.)
- Foreign Trade, 103.
- German Socialists, 32; Appendix I.
- Gill, A. H., 29.
- Gin Drinking, 19.
- Gladstone, Mr. H., 112.
- Gladstone, W. E., 136.
- Gothenburg System, 140.
- Gould, Dr., 148.
- Grantham, Judge, 6, 62.
- Harcourt, Sir Wm., 111.
- Harrogate Canteen, 182.
- Hayler, G., 116.
- Hime, Dr., 59.
- Housing, 58, 62, 78.
- Hoyle, Wm., 108.
- Idiocy, 10.
- Income Tax, 104.
- Industrial Revolution, 20.
- Insurance Companies, 15.
- Kansas, 116.
- Labour Party, 29, 30.
- Lawrence, Judge, 83.

- Lawson, Sir Wilfrid, 110.
 Leif Jones, 112.
 Liquor Trade and Unemployment, 105, 106.
 Liverpool, 5.
 Local Option, 110, 112, 119 ; in United States, 124 ;
 in Canada, 126 ; in New Zealand, 128 ; in Aus-
 tralia, 131 ; at Home, 133.
 Lunacy, 10, 16.
 Macdonnell, Sir John, 5.
 Maine, 113, 116.
 Malins, J., 116.
 Mayors, Teetotal 22.
 Medical Petition, 80.
 Mining, 38 ; Appendix II.
 Neale Dow, 166.
 Nelson, 136.
 New York, Report of Medical Academy, 11.
 Norway, 141, 145.
 Occupations, 38.
 Peel, Lord, 189.
 Permissive Bill, 110.
 Physical Deterioration, Report of Committee on, 8,
 59, 62.
 Placards, Temperance, 81.
 Port Sunlight, 136, 157.
 Poverty, 49, 86.
 Prohibition States, 114.
 Railways, 107.
 Recreation, 82 ; Appendix III.
 Rent, 101, 102.
 Rowntree, S., 88.
 Scottish Temperance League, 147.
 Sexton, J., 31.
 Shorter Hours, 74 ; Appendix III.
 Shuttleworth, Dr., 10.
 Small Holdings, 84.
 Socialists, Continental, 31.
 Steadman, W. C., 29.
 Suckling, 12.

Sullivan, Dr., 10.
 Sweden, 141, 145.
 Temperance Societies, 21, 22.
 Temperance Teaching, 80.
 Textile Trades, 37.
 Thorold Rogers, 94.
 Time Limit, 159.
 Toxteth, 102, 134.
 Trades Unions, 25 ; Fellowship, 28.
 Trust Companies, 149.
 Wages Spent on Drink, 63, 85.
 Warner, Prof., 89.
 White, Sir Geo., 85, 91, 103, 105.
 Whittaker, Sir T. P., 35, 86, 92.
 Whyte, Jas., 108, 123.
 Women and Drink, 41, 56.

THE SOCIALIST LIBRARY.

PROSPECTUS.

FOR some time it has been felt that there is a deplorable lack in this country of a Socialist literature more exhaustive and systematic than pamphlets or newspaper articles. In every other country where the Socialist movement is vigorous, such a literature exists, and owing to it Socialism has taken a firmer hold upon the intellectual classes, and, amongst Socialists themselves, its theories and aims are better understood than they are here.

Comparing the output of Socialist literature in Germany and France with Great Britain, one must be struck with the ephemeral nature of the great bulk of the matter which we publish, and the almost complete absence of any attempts to deal exhaustively with Socialism in its many bearings in economics, history, sociology and ethics. This failure is all the more to be regretted, because just as the special development of British industrialism afforded the basis for much of the constructive work of foreign Socialists half a century ago, so the growth of British democratic institutions and the characteristics of British political methods have a special and direct bearing upon Socialist theories and tactics.

It is also disquieting to think that, on the one hand, the intellectual life of our country is becoming more and more attached in its interests and sympathies to reaction, and that, on the other, so many who lift up their voices against backward tendencies either look behind with regretful regard upon policies which are exhausted and can no longer guide us, or frankly confess that they are disconsolate without hope.

To the promoters of this LIBRARY, Socialism appears to be not only the ideal which has to be grasped before the benumbing pessimism which lies upon the minds of would-be reformers can be removed, but also the one idea which is guiding such progressive legislation and administration to-day as are likely to be of permanent value. But those experimenting with it are only groping; are working with an instrument they do not understand; are applying an idea they have not grasped; and it is therefore believed that as a practical contribution to political principles and methods, the LIBRARY may be of some value.

The LIBRARY, however, with more assurance of definite success, will aim at providing studies in Socialism, or from Socialistic standpoints, which will be stimulating to the Socialist movement, and which may do something to knit together the different sections of Socialist opinion and activity in this country. It will contain translations of the best works of foreign Socialists, as well as contributions from our own writers.

It follows that the volumes will not be selected because they advocate any particular school of Socialist thought, but because they are believed to be worthy expositions of the school to which they belong.

APRIL, 1905.

LIST OF VOLUMES.

- I.—SOCIALISM AND POSITIVE SCIENCE, by PROFESSOR ENRICO FERRI. 1s. and 1s. 6d. 5th Edition.
- II.—SOCIALISM AND SOCIETY. By J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P. 1s. and 1s. 6d. 6th Edition.
- III.—STUDIES IN SOCIALISM. By J. Jaures. 1s. and 1s. 6d. 2nd Edition.
- IV.—WHITE CAPITAL AND COLOURED LABOUR. By Sydney Olivier, K.C.M.G. 1s. and 1s. 6d.
- V.—COLLECTIVISM AND INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION. By E. Vandervelde. 1s. and 1s. 6d.
- VI.—SOCIALISM AND THE DRINK QUESTION. By Philip Snowden, M.P. 1s. and 1s. 6d.
- I. EXTRA—THE REVOLUTION IN THE BALTIC PROVINCES OF RUSSIA. 1s. and 1s. 6d.
- SOCIALISM AND RELIGION. Rev. A. L. Lilley. (In preparation).
- SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY. By J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P. (In preparation).
- SOCIALISM AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS. By H. N. Brailsford. (In preparation).

These will be followed by volumes on :

- SOCIALISM AND THE RURAL POPULATION.
- SOCIALISM AND THE POSITION OF WOMEN.
- TRANSLATIONS FROM THE LEADING FOREIGN SOCIALIST WRITERS.

Independent Labour Party.

PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT.

The Socialist Library.

Volume I.—SOCIALISM AND POSITIVE SCIENCE, BY ENRICO FERRI, PROFESSOR OF PENAL LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ROME. TRANSLATED BY EDITH C. HARVEY. Paper, 1s. net; Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Fifth Edition.

“No more representative type of militant and systematic Socialism could have been chosen. The series which this Volume inaugurates promises to be both interesting and instructive, and will doubtless find attentive readers in other than Socialist circles.”—*Sydney Ball* in the *ECONOMIC JOURNAL*.

Volume II. —SOCIALISM AND SOCIETY, BY J. RAMSAY MACDONALD. Paper, 1s. net; Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Sixth Edition.

DUNDEE ADVERTISER.—“The aim of Socialism is treated in a clear, concise, and scholarly manner.”

DAILY NEWS.—“This admirable little work.”

SCOTSMAN.—“Thoughtful and instructive.”

DAILY CHRONICLE.—“Well-written, logical, and readable, and we commend it to the study of all social reformers.”

Volume III. —STUDIES IN SOCIALISM, BY JEAN JAURES. TRANSLATED BY MILDRED MINTURN. Paper, 1s. net; Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Second Edition.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS.—“Well worth reading by English Socialists and others who wish to keep in touch with the movement on the Continent.”

ATHENÆUM.—“The last essay in the book is remarkable for poetic beauty. Mr. MacDonald’s introduction contains an interesting personal pronouncement upon the future of the Labour Party in this country.”

Volume IV.—WHITE CAPITAL AND COLOURED LABOUR, BY SYDNEY OLIVIER, K.C.M.G. Paper, 1s. net ; Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.—“It may be at once stated that this is the work of an expert.”

MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.—“An important contribution to the sociology of race relations. Everyone who thinks about Imperialism should read the book.”

THE STANDARD.—“It is the object of the book to enlighten the white man concerning the real nature of the black. The case is treated with conspicuous moderation.”

THE LABOUR LEADER.—“A calm and dispassionate view of the racial problem.”

Volume V.—COLLECTIVISM AND INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION, BY EMILE VANDERVELDE. Paper, 1s. net ; Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

SCOTSMAN.—“An interesting and lucid exposition of the root doctrines of Socialism.”

DAILY NEWS.—“The author is an entirely sane and business-like Collectivist, and his broad sketch of the concentration of capital and of the practical means of securing economic enfranchisement of the people may be commended to all readers.”

MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.—“One of the cleverest, most logical, and most representative accounts of modern European Socialism.”

Extra Volume I.—THE REVOLUTION IN THE BALTIC PROVINCES OF RUSSIA, TRANSLATED BY E. O. F. AMES. SIXTEEN ILLUSTRATIONS. Paper, 1s. net ; Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

A remarkable and realistic account of the Revolution in the Baltic Provinces, and the oppressive measures taken by the Russian Government to stamp out the Socialist and Revolutionary movement in the district,

J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P. :

WOMEN IN THE PRINTING TRADES. A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY. With a Preface by Professor F. Y. Edgeworth Editor *Economic Journal*. Demy 8vo. Cloth, with Diagrams, 10s. 6d. net.

SOCIALISM. 1s. net.

LABOUR AND THE EMPIRE. 1s. net.

THE NEW UNEMPLOYED BILL OF THE LABOUR PARTY.
One Penny ; post free, 1½d.

J. Keir Hardie, M.P. :

FROM SERFDOM TO SOCIALISM. 1s. net.

JOHN BULL AND HIS UNEMPLOYED : A PLAIN STATEMENT ON THE LAW OF ENGLAND. One Penny ; by post, 1½d.

CAN A MAN BE A CHRISTIAN ON A POUND A WEEK ? One penny ; by post, 1½d.

THE CITIZENSHIP OF WOMEN : A PLEA FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE. One Penny ; by post, 1½d.

Philip Snowden, M.P. :

THE SOCIALIST'S BUDGET. 1s. net.

THE NEW WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT MADE PLAIN. One penny ; post free, 1½d.

THE INDIVIDUAL UNDER SOCIALISM. One penny ; post free, 1½d.

THE CHRIST THAT IS TO BE. One penny ; post free, 1½d.

A STRAIGHT TALK TO RATEPAYERS : FACTS FOR CITIZENS ABOUT RISING RATES, MUNICIPAL DEBT, MUNICIPAL TRADING. One penny ; post free, 1½d.

OLD AGE PENSIONS THIS YEAR. One penny ; post free, 1½d.

I.L.P. PAMPHLETS.

Each 16 to 32 pages, price 1d., post free 1½d.

Socialism.

SOCIALISM. By Rev. R. J. Campbell.

SOCIALISM. By T. D. Benson.

SOCIALISM AND SERVICE. By T. D. Benson.

TARIFF REFORM, FREE TRADE AND SOCIALISM. By T. D. Benson.

SOCIALISM AND THE BUDGET. By H. Russell Smart.

SOCIALISM AND AGRICULTURE. By Richard Higgs.

HENRY GEORGE AND SOCIALISM. By T. Russell Williams.

WILL SOCIALISM DESTROY THE HOME. H. G. Wells.

Unemployment.

THE NEW UNEMPLOYED BILL OF THE LABOUR PARTY. By J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.

THE PROBLEM OF THE UNEMPLOYED. By G. N. Barnes, M.P.

THE RIGHT TO WORK. By H. Russell Smart.

Women's Questions.

THE CITIZENSHIP OF WOMEN. By J. Keir Hardie, M.P.

WOMEN AND SOCIALISM. By Isabella O. Ford.

WOMAN—THE COMMUNIST. By T. D. Benson.

WOMAN'S FRANCHISE. By E. C. Wolstenholme Elmy.

Municipal Questions.

A STRAIGHT TALK TO RATEPAYERS. By Philip Snowden, M.P.

MUNICIPAL BREAD SUPPLY. By T. H. Griffin.

MUNICIPAL MILK SUPPLY. A. W. Short.

Miscellaneous.

THE NATIONALISATION OF RAILWAYS. By G. J. Wardle, M.P.

HUMAN DOCUMENTS. By Pete Curran, M.P.

HOW MILLIONAIRES ARE MADE. By J. Bruce Glasier.

INFANT MORTALITY. By Margaret McMillan.

MINING ROYALTIES. By T. I. Mardy Jones, F.R.E.S.

SOCIAL EDUCATION. By F. Kettle, B.A.

SECULAR EDUCATION, THE ONLY WAY. By Harry Snell.

WHO ARE THE BLOODSUCKERS? By "Casey."

THE I.L.P. YEAR BOOK. Edited by Philip Snowden, M.P.

Threepenny Booklets.

THE LABOUR PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. By H. T. Muggeridge.

"It may be said, and without exaggeration, that it is one of the most telling brochures to be found in the whole range of Socialist propagandist literature. The allegory is so quaint, so touching, so true, that in all the reviewer's reading of Socialist literature few works there are which have impressed him more deeply than this."—*Labour Leader*.

THE NEW CRUSADE : POEMS. By Arthur G. Sparrow.
FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM. By W. Stewart.
ST. GUIDO. By R. Jeffries.

The Socialist Review.

A MONTHLY REVIEW OF MODERN THOUGHT.

Discusses the theories and policy of Socialism, describes sociological and industrial changes of interest to Socialists, examines modern tendencies in legislation and commerce, and generally expresses that many-sided movement in thought and experience which is at the present moment giving such an impetus to Socialism. Of all booksellers, 6d. Foreign Subscription for one year, 8s. post free.

The Labour Leader,

The Official Organ of the Independent Labour Party. Should be read regularly by everyone interested in the Labour and Socialist movement. Of all news-agents. Weekly, One Penny. Subscription rates: One year **6s. 6d.**; half-year **3s. 3d.**; 13 weeks **1s. 8d.**

Tales from the Derbyshire Hills.

BY KATHERINE BRUCE GLASIER. 1s. 6d. net.

"Ten short stories, of varying lengths, portray very vividly the romance and charm of the Peak country. The writer knows her subject, and writes from her heart. The stories are readable and carefully written. They centre, mostly, round the Dale-folk, and convey, with sympathy and truth, the happiness and pathos of their lives."—*Literary World*.

INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY,

Publication Department, 23, Bride Lane, Fleet St., E.C.



